

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XXXV

OCTOBER 1940

Number 4

THE ANCIENT WARSHIP

CHESTER G. STARR, JR.

THE oarage of the Greco-Roman war galley has been a vexed problem for so many years that, as one views the controversial literature on the subject,¹ reconciliation of the divergent views appears clearly impossible, and establishment of a correct solution seems equally difficult. The classical scholars have usually regarded only the literary and artistic sources; the seamen, on the other hand, present practicable galleys which do not fit the ancient evidence;² and the

¹ I have found most useful the following works (with abbreviations used henceforth in brackets): E. Assmann *s.v.* *Seewesen* in August Baumeister, *Denkmäler der klassischen Altertums*, III (Munich, 1889), 1593-1639 [Assmann]; Frank Brewster, "The Arrangement of Oars in the Trireme," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, XLIV (1933), 205-25 [Brewster]; A. Cartault, *La Trière athénienne* (Paris, 1881) [Cartault]; A. B. Cook, in Leonard Whibley, *Companion to Greek Studies* (2d ed.; Cambridge, 1906), pp. 475-94 [Cook, *Comp.*]; Cook, with Wigham Richardson, "Triremes," *Classical Review*, XIX (1905), 371-77 [Cook, *CR*]; Josef Kopecky, *Die attischen Trieren* (Leipzig, 1890) [Kopecky]; August Köster, *Das antike Seewesen* (Berlin, 1923); W. W. Tarn, "The Greek Warship," *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, XXV (1905), 137-56, 204-24 [Tarn, *JHS*]; "Thranite, Zugite, and Thalamite," *Classical Review*, XX (1906), 75-77 [Tarn, *CR*]; *Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments* (Cambridge, 1930) [Tarn, *Develop.*]; "The Oarage of Greek Warships," *Mariner's Mirror*, XIX (1933), 52-74 [Tarn, *Mirror*], with comments thereon by R. C. Anderson, *ibid.*, pp. 237-38, and Tarn in reply, pp. 457-60; Cecil Torr, *Ancient Ships* (Cambridge, 1894) [Torr]; Lotar Weber, *Die Lösung des Trierenrätsels* (Danzig, 1896) [Weber].

I wish to express here my thanks to Professor M. L. W. Laistner and to the "White Library" for their criticism of the essentials in this treatment.

² The latest, Vice-Admiral W. L. Rodgers, in his *Greek and Roman Naval Warfare* (Annapolis, 1937), p. 42, suggests (after Serre) that all three banks in a trireme were used only on parade. For an example of the other extreme, the scholar aloof from practical considerations, one may cite the extraordinary solutions of B. Graser, *De veterum re navali* (Berlin, 1864), with the criticisms of Weber, pp. 42-44, and Kopecky, pp. 143-47. According to the calculations of the latter, Graser's trireme had a maximum speed of one-half knot per hour.

great advances made recently by those few persons who have used both approaches, as Tarn, Cook, and Brewster, have not received as full attention as they deserve. A recent investigation of the matter in connection with some work on the Roman imperial navy induces me to think a fresh discussion useful. A summary of the certain facts, which is the only true approach, may assist in driving the old theory of directly superimposed banks to its "Stygian cave forlorn," and in my opinion the ancient evidence, logically and practically considered, suggests that in a trireme—the crux of the problem—the rowers sat in groups of three, the innermost or *thranite* also being farthest aft and slightly higher than the *zygite*, the outermost or *thalamite* being slightly lower than the *zygite* and farthest forward.

I

There is fortunately general agreement as to the original ship from which the trireme developed. This was the *pentekontor* of Homeric and later times, which seated twenty-five men on a side with an interval of about three feet between rowers, these simply putting their oars over the side through leather loops attached to a thole.³ The three Viking ships now at Oslo may, with due reservations, be considered typical of the Greek *pentekontor*.⁴ After several centuries the trireme was evolved from this craft; Thucydides says that triremes were first built in Greece at Corinth, and some scholars have joined with Pliny in considering the Corinthian shipwright Ameinocles, who constructed four ships for the Samians about 700 B.C., as inventor of the craft.⁵ Both the ascription and the date are dubious, for it appears probable that the Greeks borrowed the idea from the Phoenicians, to whom they owed much else in seacraft, and the trireme was not the standard type of warship in the Aegean until after the beginning of the fifth century B.C.⁶

³ Assmann, pp. 1595–96; Cook, *Comp.*, pp. 475–79; Torr, p. 3, who notes that the most common vessel in Homer (apart from the Catalogue) is the ship of twenty oars.

⁴ The Oseberg ship, 21.5 × 5 meters (at its widest), had fifteen oars on a side, i.e., it would in Greek terminology be a *triakontor*. Cf. Universitetets Oldsaksamling guide, *The Viking Ship Finds* (Oslo, 1938).

⁵ Thucyd. i. 13; Pliny *H.N.* vii. 207.

⁶ Clement of Alexandria *Stromat.* i. 16. 76; Herod. ii. 159 (Necho builds triremes about 600 B.C.); Torr, p. 4; Cook, *Comp.*, p. 485.

Whatever the new principle used may have been, it apparently did not allow easily of further development, for one hears of no advance or serious change during the two war-filled centuries between Themistocles and the reign of Alexander the Great.⁷ In 330/329, however, the Athenian dockyards records list 392 triremes and 18 quadriremes; in 325/324 they list 360 triremes, 50 quadriremes, and 7 quinqueremes.⁸ Greek shipwrights had hit upon or had again borrowed from the Phoenicians a new principle,⁹ both practicable and capable of great expansion, for quinqueremes quickly became the standard vessel of Hellenistic fleets, and we find warships ranging up to a "thirty" and a "forty" in the third century B.C.¹⁰ This principle must have been new and not a direct development from that of a trireme; Athens as mistress of the Delian League had no such ships, but the far weaker Athens of the late fourth and third centuries did.

To return to the trireme, the power of a simple galley may be increased in four ways, omitting combinations: the hull may be lengthened so that more rowers may sit along the sides; more than one person may pull each oar; rowers may sit one above another, either directly or in staggered fashion, so that the oar of the man above clears the head of the rower below; or the rowers may sit one beside another on benches slanted inward and toward the stern (which the rowers faced), the slant allowing two or more oarsmen to pull their oars simultaneously without striking any of their fellows on the bench.

The first possibility is eliminated by the fact that ancient shipbuilders used wood in construction. Although strengthening cables (*ὑποζώματα*) were passed around the hull, naval architects still could not overpass a certain length without running the danger of having the ship's back broken when the two ends were held up by waves in rough seas and the center was unsupported. The docks at the Piraeus for Athenian triremes of the fourth century B.C. could contain a ship

⁷ Dionysius of Syracuse is said to have built quadriremes and quinqueremes in 396 (Diod. xiv. 41.3, 42.2, 44.7; cf. Aelian *Var.* vi. 12 and Torr, p. 5); but this was an unsuccessful attempt at most, for it had no further influence (Tarn, *Develop.*, pp. 131-32).

⁸ *IG*², II, 1627 b 266-69, 275-78; *IG*², II, 1629 d 783-812.

⁹ Tarn (*Develop.*, pp. 130-32, *Mirror*, p. 67) inclines strongly to the opinion that the Phoenicians or Cypriotes first built these larger craft (see below, Sec. V).

¹⁰ E.g., *OGIS* 39; Athenaeus v. 203-4 and Plut. *Demetrius* 43. 4-5 on the "forty." Torr (pp. 5-14) assembles the ancient evidence.

about 120×20 feet—dimensions not much greater than those of a *pentekontor*—and it is improbable that these dimensions could be greatly increased in the case of the greater galleys.¹¹ As for the second possibility, a statement by Thucydides (ii. 93. 2) indicates that in the Athenian trireme of the Peloponnesian War each rower pulled one oar, and the Athenian dockyards records of the fourth century tend to corroborate this;¹² until very weighty evidence is brought to the contrary, it may be assumed that all triremes of every epoch were similarly rowed in this essential point.

Two methods of turning a *pentekontor* into a trireme thus remain. Until the last decades of the nineteenth century the notion that the rowers in a trireme were directly superimposed in some fashion was the accepted explanation and apparently still lingers widely. The great service of seamen to the trireme problem has been the rejection of this idea as preposterous, for in such an arrangement the oars of the lowest group would be uselessly short and those of the highest unmanageably long—certainly too long to keep the necessary even beat with the other oars. The rapid spurts of which an ancient trireme was capable cannot be achieved in any such system,¹³ while a suitable angle of oar to water, approximately 20°, is possible for the lowest bank only. The same considerations destroy any theory which rests on very considerable staggering, that is, any reconstruction necessitating a vertical interval of more than one or one and a half feet between rowers; but it should be noted that vertical intervals of lower degree are not incompatible with these practical possibilities. Since it is now recognized that the larger vessels of the Hellenistic age were rowed on a different system, we are not required to formulate a system for the trireme which would be capable of indefinite expansion.

One detail of importance for the nature of the ancient trireme may be noted here—the “oar-box” or *παρεξέειρσία*, the true character of

¹¹ If Tarn (*Develop.*, p. 139) is right in suggesting that the ship's house at Delos housed a “fifteen,” this would measure 162×29 feet. Xen. *Oec.* 8. 8 and in lesser degree Cic. *Verr.* v. 51. 133 are positive evidence that the rowers in a trireme were more closely packed than an enlarged *moneres* would demand.

¹² Tarn, *JHS*, pp. 148–49; also *ibid.*, pp. 213–14 for evidence suggesting that in essentials Greek triremes of the classic period were alike. Note also Aeschylus' use of *αἱ τρισκεκαλμοὶ νῆες* for the trireme in *Persae* 677 and 1074 (Cook, *Comp.*, p. 487).

¹³ Tarn, *JHS*, p. 151 n. 56; Cook, *CR*, pp. 371–73.

which Assmann discovered and Tarn further demonstrated.¹⁴ When the galley was rowed as a *pentekontor*, the curving sides of the ship caused no difficulty; but as prerequisite to a more complicated method some device compensating for this curve was absolutely necessary. This was provided in the oar-box, "a sort of oblong frame, long and narrow, with quite straight sides"¹⁵ set atop the hull proper; since the oars in prow, waist, and stern all issued from this oar-box, they would be of the same relative length in all parts of the ship, and the rowers might row together satisfactorily.

II

The principle which permitted the creation of the trireme having thus been limited to horizontal placing of rowers one beside another on a slanted bench—the later Venetian system a *zenzile*—or to a moderate vertical spacing, necessarily combined with some horizontal slanting, one naturally turns for a final solution to the pertinent ancient evidence, and first to the ship representations painted or sculptured in the epoch when the trireme was the highest type of galley. Unfortunately, every student who has examined these warships comes away in disappointment; the examples on coins and vases are the product of convention and abstraction, and there are no larger-scale representations which settle the question.¹⁶ The arrangement on some Assyrian reliefs of about 700 B.C., in which Phoenician ships have banks vertically staggered thus . . . , can be seen on some Greek vases;¹⁷ otherwise vases and coins show one line of oars coming out of the ship like toothpicks, but even a trireme with some vertical distinction of

¹⁴ Assmann, pp. 1608–9; Tarn, *JHS*, p. 141, n. 10, and pp. 219–20, and *Develop.*, p. 125; Brewster, pp. 208–12. Thucyd. vii. 34. 5 is one of the chief passages on the point and illustrates its importance.

¹⁵ Tarn, *Develop.*, p. 125; on the subject of the ancient porthole see Tarn, *Mirror*, p. 61, with Anderson, *ibid.*, pp. 237–38, and Tarn's reply, p. 458. Separate ports for each oar remain possible.

¹⁶ On the caution with which reproductions of the artistic evidence are to be approached see the salutary remarks of Torr, pp. viii–ix.

¹⁷ The Assyrian reliefs, Torr, Figs. 10–11; a black-figure *kylix* from Vulci, Daremberg-Saglio s.v. "*navis*," Fig. 5282; and Cook, *Comp.*, p. 482, Fig. 89. There is another black-figure vase showing a warship with two banks of oars in the Museo nazionale tarquiniese at Tarquinia, but I could not discover its number or take a photograph. The term "bank" as used henceforth in this paper is intended to mean such vertically separated but not directly superimposed ranks of rowers.

rowers would have appeared thus to a casual observer.¹⁸ The ships on the Dipylon vases of the late geometric period, which have two groups of rowers, one apparently above another, are most probably explained as results of the artist's attempt to represent the rowers on the two sides of the ships.¹⁹

One representation, the relief found by Lenormant on the Acropolis in 1856 and now in the Acropolis Museum, would be of capital importance, if we knew how to interpret it. Carved apparently about 400 B.C. and so representing presumably a trireme, the dominant warcraft at the time, the fragment shows the side of a war galley just as the rowers put their weight into the stroke. One row of oarsmen sits at the top, under a deck or sun-covering; beneath them are various horizontal raised lines, the topmost of which apparently is meant as a deck or walk built out over the side of the ship, while the others are, one judges, strengthening stringers or cables. The oars of the visible rowers slant back into the water; following each of these oars is one line which indicates a strut of the walk and two further raised lines, each starting lower than the one before. In other words, the relief shows a succession of groups of three slanting lines, the first in the group being the longest and certainly an oar, and each of the other two following it successively lower, these starting from the same relative point from group to group. This has been widely claimed, therefore, as a trireme. Tarn disagrees strongly with this identification and has presented some reason for his refusal to accept the two lower lines as oars: if the proportions of the relief are right, the upper oars seem to have been very much longer than those of the lower group; the lower lines do not now cross over the horizontal lines, as they should if oars; and the lowest set commences from a round knob, which can scarcely be called a port.²⁰ These objections are not irrefutable, for the pro-

¹⁸ This is clear from Figs. 10-11 in Cook and Richardson, *CR*, pp. 376-77. A skilled naval officer, however, would certainly have been able to note the three banks in such a case.

¹⁹ Tarn, *JHS*, pp. 208-9.

²⁰ Tarn, *JHS*, pp. 211-14. In *Die griechischen Staats-, Kriegs- und Privatalttümer* (Nordlingen, 1887; Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, IV, No. 1), pp. 278-79 and Pl. VII, Adolf Bauer accepts the relief as a trireme, but in the *Neue philologische Rundschau*, 1900, pp. 302-3, he considers it a simple *moneres*. Cook (*Comp.*, p. 488) seems to think it may be a trireme. The best reproduction is in Tarn, *JHS*, p. 211; for a similar relief (Del Pozzo's sketch) see Assmann, p. 1629, Fig. 1690.

truding knobs may have been intended to represent the leather bags (*ἀσκώματα*) which are known later as a means of making the port watertight while still permitting rowing,²¹ and the whole may have been aided by paint; nevertheless, the Lenormant relief cannot by itself be considered evidence of any independent weight in the problem.²²

Accordingly we must fall back on the literary evidence, that is, on the literature produced in the fifth and fourth centuries at Athens. Although it has well been said that the trireme is present in all the works of the Athenian genius,²³ still these authors took for granted that their readers were acquainted with the galley, a not unreasonable assumption for the Athens of that period, but one which leaves us only incidental references. Such notices, however, should be good evidence; they give four main indications.

1. A rather improper jest of Aristophanes in *The Frogs*, line 1074 (*καὶ προσπαρδεῖν γ' εἰς τὸ στόμα τῷ θαλάμακι*), seems to assume that the class of rowers known as "thalamites" sat lower than the other groups; two lines of Aeschylus (*Agamemnon* 1617-18) say clearly that the thalamites as a class were lower in the boat than the group of "zygites."²⁴

2. According to Polybius (xvi. 3. 3-5) the *dekeres* of Philip in the Battle of Chios, 201 B.C., struck a *trihemiolia* κατὰ μέσον τὸ κύτος ὑπὸ τὸν θρανίτην σκαλόν, i.e., "in the middle of the hull under the thranite thole," and remained fast. It would seem that the *dekeres* struck amidships and, since it could not afterward disengage, possibly rather high, a point which may easily be explained if it approached the *trihemiolia*

²¹ The Praenestine ship relief shows these *askomata* clearly. Against Tarn, who does not think these bags were widely used or were so named in Greek (*JHS*, p. 213, n. 107), cf. Pollux i. 88 and Cartault, pp. 157-60. See also, Tarn, *Mirror*, pp. 458-59.

²² At all events the dismissal by Weber (p. 67) as a falsification by "ein schlauer Neugrieche" is not justified, for it has every appearance of genuineness.

²³ Cartault, p. 3.

²⁴ οὐ ταῦτα φωνεῖς νερέτερφ προσήμενος
κώπη, κρατούντων τῶν ἐπὶ ζυγῷ δορός;

(Tarn, *JHS*, p. 205, who makes it a *moneres dikrotos*.) His remarks (*ibid.*) on Aristophanes *Frogs* 1074 as slang do not convince me that the passage is completely unimportant. To introduce later evidence, one may note also Lucan *Phars.* iii. 529-32:

... validaeque triremes
quasque quater surgens extructi remigis ordo
commovet ...

full speed on the crest of a wave. The passage suggests that one could designate a specific part of the ship, in the vertical sense, by naming the group of oars which emerged thence.²⁵

3. Polyaeus (iii. 11. 14) notes that in a storm Chabrias put out additional steering oars through the oar-box by the thranite oars, and on another occasion (v. 43) Calliades, pursued by a faster enemy ship, kept veering so that the enemy could only strike against his "first thranite oars." Tarn, who couples with these the passage from Polybius, considers that the three instances prove the thranite group sat in the rear of the ship, the zygitae in the center, and the thalamites in the prow.²⁶ This is not necessarily the only explanation for the fact that some thranite oars were certainly aft. The Athenian naval records indicate that an Athenian trireme at that time had 62 thranite oars against 54 zygitae and 54 thalamite oars; probably the narrowing of the hull to prow and stern made it wise, despite the oar-box, to have only thranites in the last and first four rows.²⁷

4. Aristotle, in his *Mechanics* (4) and also in *De partibus animalium* (iv. 10. 27), states that οἱ μεσόνεοι had the longest oars.²⁸ Since these *mesoneoi* cannot be taken as those sitting in the waist as against those in prow and stern—the oar-box equalized oars in all sections of the ship—they must be considered those who sat nearest the middle line of the ship, reckoning from side to side. That is, a certain part of the oarsmen sat nearer the center of the ship than others and therefore needed longer oars. Now the Athenian dockyards records distinguish carefully the oars of thalamites, zygitae, and thranites, and in one place there is a note that certain thranite oars no longer serviceable as such could be used as zygitae oars.²⁹ The only satisfactory explanation

²⁵ It is, I think, permissible to assume that by τὸ κέντρος Polybius meant hull and oar-box.

²⁶ *JHS*, pp. 140–41; in *CR*, p. 76, he adduces also Polyaeus v. 22. 4, on which see *JHS*, p. 148, n. 42. Weber (pp. 16–18, 47–49, 56–58) gives the essentials of the argument.

²⁷ *IG*², II, 1618 a 52–59, after 358/357 B.C.; Torr, p. 11, n. 28. So also Anderson, *Mirror*, p. 237; Tarn (*CR*, p. 37, and *Mirror*, p. 58) disagrees with this explanation but offers no alternative apart from doubting its validity in *CR* (in *Mirror* he accepts the greater number of thranite oars).

²⁸ Also Galen *De usu part.* i. 24. Cf. Tarn, *JHS*, pp. 215–17; Kopecky, pp. 42–45; Brewster, pp. 213–14. On Lucan *Phars.* iii. 537: "et summis longe petit aequora remis" see Tarn, *JHS*, pp. 204–5.

²⁹ *IG*², II, 1604, I. 56 (377/376 B.C.).

of this remark is the assumption that these thranite oars could, by a shortening which removed the worn places, be made useful; in other words, that the three classes of oars differed, if only slightly, in length and that those of the thranites were the longest.³⁰ This would explain the higher pay of the thranites on one occasion.³¹

Since the matter is important, one may note the objections of Tarn, who feels the difficulty that it raises for his reconstruction. To meet the evidence listed under paragraphs 1 and 4 above, he suggested that the thalamites or forward squad in his theory sat lower than the others or had once been so placed.³² His further point that the dockyards' list does not "mean that *all* thranite oars were longer than *all* zygite oars"³³ leaves the three classes of oars completely unexplained; since they must have been distinguished somehow if kept so separate in the records, and, since the thranite oars were apparently longer than the zygite in one case, distinction in length seems to clear the matter. A further very serious difficulty, which Tarn does not note, is the fact that even in his arrangement for the trireme there would inevitably have been three groups of oars, distinguished according to length; if these oars are not the thalamite, zygite, and thranite, it must be argued that the Athenian naval records have no mention of these three types of varying size—a most peculiar omission in such meticulous lists.

Any reconstruction of an ancient trireme must proceed from and fit exactly the incidental references listed in the four paragraphs above.

³⁰ Note that Athenaeus v. 204a calls the thranite oars on the "forty" the longest. The *περὶ πῶς* oars, which were probably spars and so as long as the longest oars used, were at most 14½ feet long (*IG*², II, 1607 a 14, 22, 51, 55 [373/372 B.C.]). Even if they were decksweeps (so Tarn, *JHS*, p. 148, n. 44, after Assmann), they would presumably be at least as long as the thranite oars.

³¹ Thucyd. vi. 31. 2 with scholion; Brewster (pp. 214–15) notes that the thranites, as inner and forward rowers in each group, would form the stroke. Tarn (*JHS*, p. 146, n. 30) considers that as stern oars they kept the boat together, an explanation for which a medieval Venetian parallel can be cited (cf. *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, ed. Sir Henry Yule [3d ed. by Henri Cordier (London, 1903)]), I, 36.

³² *JHS*, pp. 146 and 205. A similar Venetian arrangement which he notes in his Fig. 1 (p. 138) is not perceptible in his reproduction and is not, to my knowledge, described in the Venetian literary sources.

³³ *JHS*, p. 146, n. 30. In *CR*, p. 76, Tarn suggested that the thranite oars which were given to the zygites were too weak to be used as stern oars but could serve in the waist. It would appear that the stresses on the oars would not vary so greatly through the ship. In *Mirror*, pp. 457–60, he passes over the problem silently.

Classical scholars, however, have generally relied rather on the explanations, especially of the passages in Aristophanes and Aeschylus and of the terms therein employed, which were set forward by the Byzantine scholiasts and lexicographers. Although these gentlemen, puzzled by the same terms which perplex modern scholars, had greater resources in ancient literature and scholiastic tradition, they are, on the other hand, subject to the editor's desire to explain everything and now and then can be caught devising an explanation which is clearly wrong. They are not of independent value, that is to say; and some students of the trireme problem have dismissed them altogether as pedants knowing little of the sea and nothing of naval construction centuries previously, who accordingly misinterpreted the explanations they did find. This seems too drastic; scholia may preserve authentic information, and their bad repute in this case is chiefly due to their misinterpretation by those who argued for an impossible superimposition of rowers.

There is, indeed, an interesting unanimity of scholiastic tradition on the point which makes worth while a consideration of their evidence at this point. The Byzantine commentators who touch on the thranites, zygites, and thalamites repeat one statement, the origin of which we unfortunately cannot trace. This statement is most fully preserved in a scholion on the passage in Aristophanes' *The Frogs* already quoted:

The "thalamax": the person rowing in the κάτω part of the trireme. The "thalamax": the *thalamakes* received little pay because they used short oars as against the other groups of rowers, inasmuch as they were nearest the water. There were three groups of rowers: those κάτω thalamites, those μέση zygites, those ἄνω thranites. The thranite therefore was the one toward the stern, the zygite the middle, and the thalamite the one toward the prow.³⁴

Pollux of Alexandria, who wrote between A.D. 166 and 176—a period in which the ancient war galleys were still in common use—has an-

³⁴ τῷ θαλάμακι: τῷ κωπηλατοῦντι ἐν τῷ κάτω μέρει τῆς τριηροῦς. τῷ θαλάμακι: οἱ θαλάμακες ὀλίγον ἐλάμβανον μισθὸν διὰ τὸ κολοβαῖς χρῆσθαι κώπαις παρὰ τὰς ἄλλας τάξεις τῶν ἐρετῶν ὅτι μᾶλλον ἦσαν ἐγγὺς τοῦ ὕδατος. ἦσαν δὲ τρεῖς τάξεις τῶν ἐρετῶν· καὶ ἡ μὲν κάτω θαλαμίται, ἡ δὲ μέση ζυγίται, ἡ δὲ ἄνω θρανίται· θρανίτης οὖν ὁ πρὸς τὴν πρύμναν, ζυγίτης ὁ μέσος, θαλάμιος ὁ πρὸς τὴν πρῶραν. This is quoted by Tarn (*JHS*, p. 142, n. 14) along with the very similar statements of Hesychius, Zonaras, Suidas, *Etymologicum magnum*, scholion on Arist. *Acharn.* 162. Eustathius 640. 11 says definitely that the thalamites were below (ὑπὸ) the thranites, but this appears to be a mere restating of the tradition.

other definition for the three terms, which must in my opinion be considered independent evidence of merit:

[The hull] can also be called *thalamos* where the thalamites row; the middle of the ship is the *zuga*, where the zygitēs sit, the region about the *katastroma* the *thranos*, where are the thranites.³⁵

This is less explicit in that the place of the thranites, which is *περί* the *katastroma* or upper deck, is at first sight puzzling, but the passage can only mean that the thranites are in proximity to the upper deck.

To adherents of the superimposition theory the remarks of Pollux accord with those of the scholion, and between them they show that the zygitēs sat directly or nearly directly above the thalamites, and the thranites above the zygitēs;³⁶ *κάτω* and *ἄνω* are interpreted in their usual sense of "below" and "above," the thalamites using short oars and getting less pay contrast with the thranites getting higher pay and using longer oars, and the last sentence of the Aristophanes scholion merely indicates that the three groups may have been staggered upward toward the stern.

III

A number of years ago, however, Tarn delivered a powerful and justified attack against this reliance on the scholia, which is coupled with a very ingenious solution of the problem. Since this discussion is at once a highly important contribution and also, of the more recent studies, the one which English-speaking readers are most likely to meet, it deserves special attention. On the basis of the evidence in Polyænus and Polybius cited above and also of his investigation of the term *δίκροτος*, noted below, Tarn decided that the three groups known for the trireme were horizontal divisions of the crew from front to stern, and further deduced from the passages in Aristotle and Galen that the rowers sat three on a bench, on a horizontal plane, in the fashion of the Venetian galleys *a zenzile* of the fourteenth and fifteenth

³⁵ καλοῖτο δ' ἄν καὶ θάλαμος, οὗ οἱ θαλάμοι ἐρέττονται· τὰ δὲ μέσα τῆς νεῆς ζῦγα οὗ οἱ ζύγιοι καθήνται, τὸ δὲ περί τὸ κατάστρομα θράνος οὗ οἱ θρανῖται (i. 89 [ed. Bethel]). On the *katastroma* see Assmann, p. 1607. Brewster (pp. 224-25) thinks it may originally have been a raised gangway, a meaning for which there is no evidence; *περί* may contain a notion of mere physical proximity.

³⁶ The isolated scholion on Aelian is even clearer, ἡ μονήρης καὶ διήρης καὶ ἐφεξῆς κατὰ τοὺς στίχους τοὺς κατὰ τὸ ὕψος ἐπ' ἀλλήλοις (Tarn, *JHS*, p. 204, n. 78), but this scholion cannot be right; the larger vessels become preposterous in such a system (see below).

centuries, each rower using a separate oar.³⁷ Certain parallels, notably the use of ἀναφέρειν to denote the action of bringing the oar aft for a new stroke, suggested to Tarn that κάτω and ἄνω might have been used in Greek nautical terminology to mean "fore" and "aft" respectively, the thalamites being those to the far end of the galley as one entered it with the poop to the shore. In this case the scholiast on Aristophanes would have accidentally preserved genuine information, and the insertion of "therefore" in the last sentence of his scholion would be natural: the thalamites were κάτω and therefore toward the prow.

Tarn opened an entirely new field by considering the naval term δίκροτος, for the *Etymologicum magnum* defines a *dikrotos* ship as one having two groups of rowers just as the trireme has three.³⁸ This was generally taken as indicating that the *dikrotos* had two banks; Tarn argued that it really meant that such a ship had its oarsmen divided into two groups, fore and aft. His proof rests on the following chain: Arrian (*Anab.* vi. 5. 2) states that the *dikrotoi* in Alexander's fleet on the Hydaspes, "hardly keeping their κάτω oars above the water,"³⁹ suffered severely and were in part sunk in a storm. Now Arrian had previously said that the only warships in this fleet were *triakontors*, which were certainly small one-banked vessels having fifteen men on a side, and ἡμιολίαι. Appian, *Mithr.* 92, however, in discussing the Cilician pirates states that they first used *myoparones* and *hemioliiai*, then *dikrotoi* and triremes; accordingly *dikrotoi* are not the same as *hemioliiai*, a definition by Hesychius which directly equates the two being wrong,⁴⁰ and the *dikrotoi* in Arrian are *triakontors*. The ports κάτω are then those forward, and the ships plunging in the rough water had their forward ports filled by the waves. In any case, quite apart from Appian, the *dikrotoi* of Arrian cannot have been biremes, that is, with two men on a bench, because biremes are not known until the first century B.C., the Greek term *διήρης* occurring in fact first in Polux; further, Thucydides gives no notice of such craft in his history of

³⁷ Brewster (pp. 205-8) best elaborates this system as an arrangement in the trireme.

³⁸ *Ety. mag.* 277. 1: δίκροτος ναῦς, ἡ δύο τοίχους ἐπετῶν ἔχουσα ὥσπερ τριήρης ἢ τρεῖς. Bekker (*Anecdota*, I, 240.9) has στοίχους (Cartault, p. 130). For Tarn's argument see *JHS*, pp. 143-48.

³⁹ τὰς κάτω κώπας οὐκ ἐπὶ πολὺ ἔξω ἔχουσαι τοῦ ὕδατος.

⁴⁰ ἡμιολία· ἡ δίκροτος ναῦς.

shipbuilding.⁴¹ Arrian's *dikrotoi* then had two groups, and accordingly the trireme had three; the parallel terms *μονόκροτος* and *τρίκροτος* are rarely met because, on the one hand, small one-group warships were called *lembi*, *triakontors*, etc., and, on the other, *trikrotos* was ambiguous, the threefold division of the rowers into thalamite, zygite, and thranite being common to triremes and all larger galleys.⁴² More recently Tarn has strengthened the essential identification of *triakontor* and *dikrotos* by adducing a first-century B.C. papyrus in which the crew of an Egyptian *dikrotos* on land service had apparently thirty-two men.⁴³

The logical weakness of Tarn's discussion is immediately apparent: having decided that the threefold division of thalamites, zygites, and thranites, which came in with the trireme, is an arrangement from front to stern, he has also to say that a trireme had three men on a bench, as against one on the older *pentekontor*.⁴⁴ The appearance of this double trichotomy with the trireme is surprising; a priori one would equate the two sets of threes, and I think the evidence demands such equation—that is, the terms "thranite," "zygite," and "thalamite" apply to the three men on each bench.

To practically all investigators, extraordinarily enough, these terms have no indissoluble, essential connection with the trireme; they appear with it and somehow describe its groups of rowers, but they carry over to the greater vessels automatically. Tarn states that the *trikrotos* arrangement was found in triremes and larger ships; Assmann, working on an impracticable superimposition theory, had the three banks repeating one after another. This general applicability of the words has been taken for granted; at least I have seen no formal proof for it, and indeed there does not seem to be any proof. Whereas the words are found from time to time in Thucydides, Xenophon,

⁴¹ Tarn (*JHS*, pp. 144, 146-48 [with n. 141], and 208) admits that these *triakontors* divided into two squads were made into biremes, this in the first century B.C., so that henceforth *dikrotos* might mean breme.

⁴² Tarn, *JHS*, p. 148; *Mirror*, pp. 56-57.

⁴³ Tarn, *Develop.*, pp. 128, 162-66; the papyrus, P. Berl. 13945, was published by Wolfgang Kunkel in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, VIII (1927), 190-97 [hereafter cited as "Kunkel"], ll. 20-22 being the especially pertinent part.

⁴⁴ In similar fashion a *dikrotos*, which Tarn considers to be a breme from the first century B.C. on, had two groups, fore and aft, and also two men on each bench.

Aristophanes, and other writers of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C., they occur most rarely after that period. The only certain instance in Polybius is the passage cited above, and this deals specifically with a *trihemiolia*, which Tarn is probably right in calling a kind of trireme.⁴⁵ In Appian's description (*B.C.* v. 107) of Naulochus (36 B.C.) the flagship of Sextus' admiral Papias has thalamites and others, for when it is struck by the ship of Agrippa the latter escape but the thalamites do not; the class of the flagship is not given, but it could as well have been a trireme as any other.⁴⁶ To my knowledge the sole example of rowers in a vessel larger than a trireme being called by one of these terms is in Callixenus' description of the famous "forty" of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the thranite oars of which were the longest and had compensating lead weights on the inboard portion.⁴⁷ We cannot say how this craft was rowed, but it seems quite possible that it had three banks, directly superimposed, in which case the banks might have been named after those of a trireme. It is a striking fact and not without significance that the Romans, who first built great fleets when the quinquereme was the standard vessel, never felt it necessary to transliterate the Greek words *θρανίτης*, *ζυγίτης*, and *θαλαμίτης*. They would seem, all in all, linked directly with the trireme.

If this is true—and the evidence noted above under paragraphs 1 through 4 supports rather a vertical than a horizontal division of the ship's company—any reason for assuming that the thranites, zygitēs, and thalamites were sections from front to rear disappears. The ship's

⁴⁵ *JHS*, pp. 141 (n. 11 [Photius calls it such]) and 147. The argument of Chr. Blinkenberg in *Triemiolia* (Copenhagen, 1938) that *hemiolia* and *trihemiolia* were vessels having their rowers doubled abaft the mast and single forward (so too Cook, *Comp.*, p. 492; Assmann, p. 1610), the latter being the Rhodian term, does not convince me. The reading of the better manuscripts does not mention thranites in Polybius xxv. 4. 10, and Hesychius s.v. *θρανίτιδες κώραι* (Tarn, *Mirror*, pp. 56–57) is not strong evidence.

⁴⁶ Or a quadrireme (see Sec. V below). Sextus' fleet was light on the average (Appian *B.C.* v. 106).

⁴⁷ Athenaeus v. 204a. Pollux, according to Tarn (*CR*, p. 76), mentions the various types of warships and then treats of them as a whole, so that "when he says that there were three classes of rowers he refers to warships generally and not merely to triremes." This is not quite correct; Pollux names the types in i. 82, and only in i. 88 the three classes. If one does wish to use the argument of logical connection in his paragraphs, it is to be noted that just before naming the thranites, etc., Pollux has mentioned triremes as the warship par excellence. Incidentally, I do not think that "Pollux would see the trireme somewhat as we see Drake's ships," for the trireme was the standard vessel in the Roman imperial navy—and was surely built on the Greek model.

organization certainly betrays no sign of a threefold arrangement; we are told that the steersman supervised those aft as the *πρωρεῖς* those forward, and a similar dichotomy occurs in the fact that the rowers of each side were supervised by a *τοίχαρχος*.⁴⁸ The rare appearance of the term *trikrotos* is to be explained not by the fact that it was ambiguous but by the reason that it was an exact equivalent of the more popular *trieres*; it was used only to avoid repetition, as an excellent example from Pseudo-Aristides demonstrates conclusively.⁴⁹ Tarn's interpretation of *κάτω* and *ἄνω*, which derives its chief strength from a preliminary identification of the groups as fore and aft, seems to me highly doubtful; with regard to the only real evidence, that of the word *ἀναφέρειν*, it may be noted that in bringing the oar aft for another stroke one must also lift it "up" out of the water.⁵⁰

If a ship *trikrotos* does not have three sections, then a *dikrotos* need not; even without reference to the *Etymologicum magnum* one may consider it a bireme. A passage from Xenophon (*Hell.* ii. 1. 28) points in the right direction: Lysander caught the Athenian fleet unprepared at Aegospotami in 405 B.C., and the Athenian sailors, who were scattered, did not all get back to their ships; as a result, "some of the ships were *dikrotoi*, others *monokrotoi*, and some completely empty." The most reasonable explanation surely is not that whole sections of the rowers did not return but that there were only one or two men present in each little group of three—here a zygite and thalamite, there a thranite and zygite, etc.—triremes thus becoming biremes or *moneres*. As for Tarn's arguments, Appian's remark is not necessarily to be read as establishing exclusive groups: Appian may have sought variety as any other author, and in this case use of two terms approximating the same thing may have been intended to phrase neatly the thought of progression, that "the pirates used first one-bank and two-

⁴⁸ Cartault, pp. 167, 226-33.

⁴⁹ *Rhodiaca* 4 (ed. Keil): *τρήρεις δὲ ἐπὶ τοῖς ὑπὸν ἰδεῖν δικρότους καὶ τρικρότους καὶ εἰς ἑπτά καὶ εἰς ἑνὶα στρούχους*. Pseudo-Aristides, using *trieres* as generic term for warship (Torr, p. 16), employs *trikrotos* in its place as a word parallel in meaning to quinquereme, etc. *Monokrotos*, also rare, may be found in Strabo vii. 7. 6 as meaning *moneres*.

⁵⁰ In Thucyd. vii. 65, where the Syracusans put up hides on the prow and a great part of the ship *ἄνω* against the Athenian grappling irons, Tarn (*JHS*, p. 145, n. 25) admits that this may refer to the upper works of the ship. See also Tarn, *Mirror*, pp. 57 and 457; Anderson, *ibid.*, p. 337.

bank ships; then they used two-bank and three-bank vessels." The *dikrotoi* in Alexander's fleet could thus be *hemioliai* and so give support to Hesychius' statement that a *dikrotos* was a *hemiolia*. A consideration of the shipwreck strengthens such an identification and induces one to think that a *dikrotos* must have lower (*κάτω*) and higher ports, for if a wave engulfed the forward ports, as Tarn suggests, it would in most rivers lick along the side of the boat, as the stern came down, at about the same level, thus filling *all* the ports. The late Ptolemaic papyrus which Tarn cites lists the crews of certain other ships as between sixty and eighty-five men; as it stands these are not specifically stated to be *dikrotoi*, but they immediately precede the *monokrotoi*.⁵¹ This would suggest that the thirty-two men from the one *dikrotos* might not be all the crew of that ship, a point strengthened by the fact that the entry does not follow the form of the others and was possibly appended to the statement.

Biremes, then, which may be considered as vessels having their rowers in pairs, one slightly above and inboard of the other, would have existed in the reign of Alexander and earlier, inasmuch as these *hemioliai* and *dikrotoi* were used from the early fourth century B.C. onward. Tarn, however, thinks this completely wrong: the word parallel to *trieres*, i.e., *dieres*, does not occur earlier than Pollux; *biremis* is met in Latin only from Cicero on, and *dikrotos*, which was its Greek equivalent, did not take this meaning, according to Tarn, until the first century B.C. By assuming that the *dikrotos* of the earlier period was a bireme as well, we obviate the need for explaining the shift in its meaning; and in any case we have good evidence that vessels with two vertically distinct lines of oars did exist in the classical Greek period, for there are the vase paintings already noted. Tarn must explain these as indicating that the ancient world knew two systems of rowing—in one bank and in two. The bireme, at all events, was scarce in the Greek world until the fourth century B.C., and it is true that Thucydides does not note it in his discussion of early shipbuilding. The reason, I suggest, lies in the strong possibility that the Greeks

⁵¹ P. Berl. 13945 also presumably follows the arrangement of P. Berl. 13959 (Kunkel, pp. 197–99), in which the middle ships on the list are stated to be *dikrotoi*. Kunkel (p. 192) agrees with Tarn that the Aphrodisias, captain of a ship in P. Berl. 13945, l. 15, is not the same person as the Aphrodisias, captain of a *dikrotos* in P. Berl. 13959, l. 21, but the identity may be more than coincidence.

turned their *pentekontors* directly into triremes under Phoenician influence. About 700 B.C. the Phoenicians had vessels with two banks of oars, shown in the Assyrian reliefs; shortly thereafter they developed three banks, for Necho built triremes about 600 B.C., and the Greeks, who underwent strong orientalizing influences in the seventh century, took over the trireme as such. Later the use of a two-bank vessel became expedient, and from the fourth century on it was a standard part of the fleets. Since it had no direct kinship with the *trieres* by being an evolutionary step toward the latter, it received, for some special reason, the names *hemiolia* and *dikrotos*; the *dieres* of Pollux is a later formation, probably under the influence of the Latin *biremis*.

IV

With the sound ancient evidence thus presented and its meaning more fully developed through analysis of Tarn's argument, I should like to present a personal guess as to the most likely arrangement of the trireme's oars. Some evidence was adduced above to show that the oars of the three groups on a trireme differed in length, and that the oars of the *thranites* were the longest. This would be readily understandable if the *thranites* are, with Brewster, considered those rowers on each bench in a horizontal system a *zenzile* who sat closest to the center of the boat and were thus farthest from the side of the galley; such an arrangement also fits Aristotle's statement that one group did sit closest to the center.⁵² However, this solution does not agree with the fact that various bits of evidence suggest the rowers did not sit on the same level or with the fact that the oars so issued from the side of the trireme that one could identify a place on the side, within the relatively narrow band of the oar-box, by naming the appropriate group; in a purely horizontal system the *thranite* oars would form one straight line with those of the *thalamites* and *zygites*, unless one adopts Tarn's hypothesis of three sections from prow to stern. In that case, however, the *thranite* oars could not, in view of the oar-box, be longer than those of the other groups. All in all, the Venetian trireme a *zenzile*, with three men on a horizontal bench, does not square with the facts known about the ancient galley.

As the only possible explanation, then, granted the correctness of

⁵² Brewster, pp. 205-8, 214; on p. 224 he notes Cook's solution.

these underlying facts, we have left an arrangement of groups of three in which each thranite was to some extent above the zygite, and this rower above the thalamite, with the thalamite closest to the side of the ship and the thranite nearest the center and highest.⁵³ The thranite in each group would also be the farthest aft—the rowers facing the stern, it will be remembered—and the thalamite, the outer man, the farthest forward, so that all three rowers might pull in unison. This solution agrees in all essentials with that of Cook, although it has been arrived at independently and through a rather different chain of argument.⁵⁴ A practical shipbuilder, Mr. Wigham Richardson, had a scale model of such an arrangement constructed, in which the oars were 10, 12, and 13½ feet long, the ports being a foot above the water, and apparently a practical test of the system was made, with good results.⁵⁵

From the point of view of actual requirements in rowing, this arrangement has a decided advantage over the purely horizontal system which was not pointed out by Richardson: by raising each bank, the angle of oar to water can be kept the same, thus assuring the maximum power. Further it agrees completely with the first-class literary evidence as to vertical distinction of banks, length of oars, and horizontal relationships which has been cited above and incidentally suggests that the scholiast tradition is derived from good sources, for the

⁵³ Brewster (p. 212) adduces Pollux i. 88: ἡ δὲ παρὰ τοὺς θρανίτας ὁδὸς πάροδος, παρὰ-θρανός as referring to the central gangway. This is possibly right, but in Athenaeus v. 203e the *parodoi* are on the outside of the ship.

⁵⁴ The solution of Bauer (Iwan Müller's *Handbuch*, IV, Abt. 1, 278–79), accepted apparently by Cartault (Tarn, *JHS*, p. 137, n. 1), allows "wenig über 1 Meter" for the three banks, which is perhaps too much. Tarn (*JHS*, p. 218, n. 128, and *Develop.*, p. 129, n. 1) admits the possibility of Cook's system, but the whole force of his argument is for a purely horizontal arrangement, which seems to me contrary to the evidence, even though nautically possible.

⁵⁵ Cook, *Comp.*, pp. 487–88; Cook and Richardson, *CR*, pp. 376–77 with Figs. 9–12; Tarn, *Develop.*, p. 129, n. 1. Richardson, however, placed his actual ports all on the same level, with the result that the outboard portion of each oar is of the same length and the inboard section is much greater for thranite than for thalamite. The proportion might be maintained constant—surely a desirable point—if the ports were raised one above another to correspond with the rise in the rowers' seats, and the oar-box, necessarily strong, could have furnished the parallel horizontal stringers needed as bases for the tholes; this system, then, would agree with the literary evidence of Polybius, Arrian, etc. Regardless of theory, such vertically staggered ports were practicable and were used, as the early Greek vases and the representations of Hellenistic warcraft noted in Sec. V, below, attest.

thranites being above (*ἄνω*) would be by that very fact aft.⁵⁶ Although the etymological derivation of the words used for these three groups cannot be certainly established, good root words can be found which accord with their location: *θαλαμία* is used of the ship's ports, by which the thalamites sat; the *ζυγά* or beams were above the hull; *θρᾶνος* is a term used for a stool, on which the thranites would have sat.⁵⁷ One feature of this solution which commends it is the fact that to my knowledge it fits with every mention of the trireme and explains most successfully the obscure passages; for example, in the flagship of Papias mentioned above the thranites and zygitēs were able to break open the deck—at the center surely—and escape, while the thalamites, overwhelmed by the rushing water and farthest from the break, were drowned.

Such a system, to be sure, is not that employed in Italian galleys of the medieval period; however, too great reliance on the Venetian systems of rowing,⁵⁸ as being the only possibilities or indeed of being faithful descendants from the ancient galley, is hazardous, and no system which bases itself chiefly on the Venetian evidence can attain certainty for the Greco-Roman trireme. The gap between even A.D. 200 and A.D. 1300 is a long one, and intermediate links are very scant; in some points at least the Venetian systems represent a completely independent sequence of development. According to the contemporary Marino Sanuto, the Venetians before 1290 used biremes, that is, craft with two oarsmen on each bench, and turned to triremes only after that date; the great galleys *di scaloccio*, in which several men pulled

⁵⁶ As noted above, the casual observer would not appreciate the small vertical interval in oars. Acceptance of this solution does not necessarily make the Lenormant relief a trireme. As for the proportions between the oars, Kopecky (pp. 36–40) devised a system which fitted the relief; and for my part I must say that the regular appearance of lines in groups of three, staggered downward to the prow, fits in part the arrangement suggested above. If they are not oars, then what are they? Struts would also pass outside the horizontal stringers if they supported the outer deck.

⁵⁷ Cf. Torr in Tarn, *JHS*, p. 218, where Tarn has a different explanation; Cook, *Comp.*, p. 487; and the new Liddell and Scott under the respective words.

⁵⁸ See especially Luigi Fincati, *Le Triremi* (2d ed.; Rome, 1881), more accessible in Serre's translation, *Les Marines de guerre de l'antiquité et du Moyen Âge* (Paris, 1885), pp. 154–208; note p. 201, n. 1 (of Serre), a vertically staggered arrangement which would diminish the "deadwork" and the length of the oars, and his remarks, pp. 197–98, on the rapidity with which knowledge of the Venetian trireme was lost. See also *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, ed. Yule (Cordier³), I, 31–41.

one oar, did not come in until the sixteenth century. Accordingly it cannot be said that the Venetian triremes are direct descendants of the ancient galleys, nor is indebtedness clear even in the biremes.⁵⁹ More important, the Venetian galley was most certainly not like the trireme in certain demonstrable points. The oars of the Venetian trireme *a zenzile* ranged from 26½ to 33 feet, the sides of the craft being 6 feet high, as against the much shorter oars and lower ports of the ancient trireme; the vertical interval between banks, which is undeniable even in the classical Greek period, occurs later, to my knowledge, only in a bare suggestion of Marino Sanuto the elder (*f.* 1300–1320) which was apparently never put into practice.⁶⁰ With such points of difference, general analogy must be limited; the Venetian records show how a galley could be built and to that extent afford helpful suggestions, but those records do not demonstrate how a trireme *must* be constructed.

V

On the larger vessels of the Hellenistic age one can do little but repeat Tarn, for on this subject he has said the final word until new evidence appears.⁶¹ In the Athenian quadriremes and quinqueremes of 330–325 B.C., one and two men, respectively, were apparently added inboard of the thranites, for the dockyard records state that the equipment of triremes, which usually includes the oars, could be used in a quadrireme, and that of a quadrireme in a quinquereme.⁶² This

⁵⁹ In the ninth century Leo VI (*Tactica* xix. 7–10 [Migne, *PG*, Vol. CVII]) describes dromons which apparently had two banks of oars; the Venetians, if they borrowed thence, may well have placed the two oarsmen on a horizontal bench in a simpler arrangement.

⁶⁰ Against an argument that the threefold division of the Venetian crews from front to stern is an inheritance, it may be noted that if the stern section is highest in rank (as the thranites in Tarn's system), the prow section is the next highest; the thalamites, on the other hand, were the lowest in ancient galleys (*The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, I, 36).

⁶¹ *JHS*, pp. 148–56, and especially *Develop.*, pp. 122–41; Cook, *Comp.*, pp. 490–92. See also Tarn, *Mirror*, pp. 67–74.

⁶² *IG*², II, 1632 a 30–35, c 233–36, 336–40 (323/322 B.C.); Tarn, *JHS*, p. 149, and *Develop.*, pp. 131–32. The oars transferred could naturally be used only by comparable classes in the larger vessels. It is possible that the quadriremes continued to have groups of four, each with a separate oar (Tarn, *Develop.*, p. 131, n. 1, and *Lucan Phars.* iii. 529–32). In this event the terms "thalamite," "zygite," and "thranite" might have been used on a quadrireme (but on this class only), the fourth class receiving some name which has, in view of its rarity, not come down or perhaps simply being entitled thranite also, for it too would use a stool. Accordingly, Papias' ship could have been a quadrireme.

method does not appear to have been satisfactory—it was indeed complicated—and Tarn is surely right in suggesting that thereafter more than one man, standing upright, pulled each oar in the fashion of the Venetian galleys *di scaloccio*.⁶³ In a quinquereme, thus, five men pulled each sweep, and the method could be expanded greatly. The evidence is scanty and does not put the matter beyond question for the most skeptical, yet it seems the most reasonable and, when it comes to the larger ships such as the *dekeres*, the only mode possible. Strictly speaking these vessels were not so much larger as heavier, for abundant evidence shows that a quinquereme and even a *dekeres* did not stand much higher in the water than a trireme, Antony's ships at Actium being only ten feet above the water level.⁶⁴ The quinquereme, which needed only one or two experienced men on each oar, remained the standard warcraft in the Hellenistic and Roman Republican fleets,⁶⁵ but in the Empire the greater vessels decreased in importance, and the trireme again became the chief component in the Mediterranean fleets.

With the Hellenistic and Roman periods we obtain a greater diversity of artistic representations of ships. The only example certainly showing a ship with three banks of oars, a coin of Gordian III (A.D. 238–44), is late in date but may reflect the tendency of the period to treat objects schematically;⁶⁶ otherwise artists drew triremes with one bank as previously. Ships with two banks occur more frequently, but the exact meaning is not easily to be determined; in no case of this period is a ship necessarily a bireme because it has two banks of oars. The ships carved in the reliefs of Trajan's column, though grotesquely erroneous in many details, have two staggered banks represented so carefully and constantly that we may consider them biremes of the

⁶³ The best evidence is Polyb. viii. 4. 2, translated by Livy xxiv. 34. 6, who uses *ordo remorum* for the oars of a quinquereme. Appian *B.C.* iv. 85 suggests that the rowers stood.

⁶⁴ Orosius vi. 19. 9; Tarn, *JHS*, pp. 152–55.

⁶⁵ On the decreased efficiency of man-power in *di scaloccio* systems cf. the papal captain Pantera in *The Book of Ser Marco Polo*, I, 33; cf. also Kopecky, p. 63.

⁶⁶ Francesco Gnechi, *I Medaglioni romani* (Milan, 1912), II, 91, n. 39, Pl. 105, n. 8. Assmann (p. 1611, Fig. 1678 [after Rich]) erroneously makes it into a quadrireme. On the triremes in a relief from Puteoli and a fresco from Pompeii (Assmann, Figs. 1676, 1691, with p. 1630) see Tarn, *JHS*, p. 206, n. 86.

classis Moesica or the *classis praetoria Ravennas*,⁶⁷ inasmuch as the great warships of the Hellenistic period were no longer used. In one instance the artist has even created a ship of three banks, the oars arranged . . . , an impossible system which is usually considered an artistic error, yet the sculptor may have intended to show a trireme of the Ravennate fleet.⁶⁸ A fine graffito on the wall of a house at Delos shows a ship with two banks of oars along with others of one bank;⁶⁹ quite probably it is a *dikrotos*, but in this region, which saw the big ships most often, one cannot be dogmatic. The prow of the ship which bears the "Victory of Samothrace" on the great staircase of the Louvre seems to have an oar-box with two ports, only slightly different in height; a similar arrangement is met on the great ship figured in the Palazzo Spada relief, a Roman copy of a Hellenistic work,⁷⁰ and especially on the ship relief from Praeneste now in the Vatican.⁷¹ Since these last two are clearly heavy warships with fighting castles, they at least are probably greater Hellenistic ships, perhaps *dekereis*, in which one group of five may have pulled one oar and rather above this group another set of five pulled another.⁷²

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

⁶⁷ Conrad Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Traianssäule* (Berlin, 1896-1900), Pls. 25-26, 34-35, 58-59, 61, 63. As Brewster (p. 220) says: "The fact that the artist paid no attention to such details as the proportions between the size of the boats and the men in them, or to the space between the oars and other items, does not, of course, warrant a disregard of his evidence, provided we know what facts he wished to depict." The staggering seems to me an intentional fact; for a mixture of carefulness and negligence in an allied field see Marcel Durry, *Les Cohortes prétorienne* (Paris, 1938), pp. 199-200, 218-22, 232-36, on the praetorians of the column.

⁶⁸ Cichorius, *Die Reliefs der Traianssäule*, Pl. 58.

⁶⁹ Section of the Theater, Ins. VI, House 1. *BCH*, XXX (1906), 549-52, Figs. 19 and 17-20; the *Exploration archéologique de Délos*, VIII, i (Paris, 1922), 58-59, 203-5, Figs. 86-88, does not reproduce the two-banked ship, but it is still in a state of good preservation.

⁷⁰ The reproduction in Assmann (Fig. 1696) does not show that the forward oar of each pair is the lower of the two; for a better section, showing also the Ludovisi copy, see Daremberg-Saglio s.v. "navis," Figs. 5273-74 (the Spada relief is Fig. 5274).

⁷¹ Franz Miltner, "Das praenestine Biremenrelief," *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Instituts*, XXIV (1929), 88-111; Robert Heidenreich, "Zum Biremenrelief aus Praeneste," *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Röm. Abt.* LI (1936), pp. 337-46.

⁷² Tarn, *JHS*, pp. 209-12; *Develop.*, pp. 136-38; *Mirror*, pp. 71-74, criticized by Anderson, *ibid.*, p. 238, with Tarn's reply, p. 459.

THE ANNALS OF THE PONTIFEX MAXIMUS

J. E. A. CRAKE

IT IS of the utmost importance for the study of the history of the early Roman Republic to have some clear understanding of the nature of the *annales* kept by the Pontifex Maximus, when they began to be kept, and what redactions were made. Numerous discussions of these questions have left no general agreement,¹ and a fresh review of the evidence seems to be desirable. Our principal difficulty is the scarcity of information. Yet what we have presents a reasonably clear picture, if we do not confuse it by the introduction of unfounded theories. The intention of this article is to re-examine this evidence for each of these three questions: nature of the annals, date of the earliest preserved tablets, and date of the first redaction.

I. NATURE OF THE ANNALS

Our problem here is to decide exactly what is meant in the different references to the subject. There are five passages which afford information on the character of the annals; all but one of these has had divergent interpretations. It is most convenient to quote all five. Cicero says:

Ab initio rerum Romanarum usque ad P. Mucium, pontificem maximum, res omnes singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus referebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi; eique etiam nunc annales maximi nominantur.²

¹ The most important are: A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Les Pontifes de l'ancienne Rome* (Paris, 1871), pp. 250-64; C. Cichorius, s.v. "Annales," *R.-E.*, I, cols. 2248-55; A. Enmann, "Die älteste Redaction der Pontificalannalen," *Rhein. Mus.*, LVII (1902), 517-33; W. Soltau, *Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtschreibung* (Leipzig, 1909), pp. 10-16; E. Kornemann, "Die älteste Form der Pontificalannalen," *Klio*, XI (1911), 245-57; *Der Priestercodez in der Regia und die Entstehung der altrömischen Pseudogeschichte* (Tübingen, 1912); C. W. Westrup, "On the Antiquarian-Historiographical Activities of the Roman Pontifical College," *Det Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser*, XVI, No. 3 (København, 1929), 31-45; M. Gelzer, "Der Anfang römischer Geschichtschreibung," *Hermes*, LXIX (1934), 46-55. See further Schanz-Hosius, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I (München, 1927), 31 f.

² *De orat.* ii. 52. This and most of the other passages discussed are collected in Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum fragmenta*, pp. 1-5.

Servius writes:

Tabulam dealbatam quotannis pontifex maximus habuit, in qua prae-scriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratuum digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militiaeque terra marique gesta per singulos dies, cuius diligentiae annuos commentarios in octoginta libros veteres retulerunt eosque a pontificibus maximis, a quibus fiebant, annales maximos appellarunt.³

Macrobius says:

Pontificibus enim permissa est potestas memoriam rerum gestarum in tabulas conferendi et hos annales appellant equidem maximos quasi a pontificibus maximis factos.⁴

Cato, quoted by Gellius, writes:

Non lubet scribere, quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumine caligo aut quid obstiterit.⁵

Finally Dionysius, speaking of the date of the founding of Rome, writes:

οὐ γὰρ ἤξιουν . . . ἐπὶ τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι κειμένου πίνακος ἐνὸς καὶ μόνου τὴν πίστιν ἀβασάνιστον καταλιπεῖν.⁶ *

All five authors speak of a *tabula*, or *πίναξ*, kept by the Pontifex Maximus on which he entered all events of interest that happened in the state. Three of the passages say further that these tablets, or their contents, were subsequently known as *annales maximi*. Naturally Cato does not mention this, for the name apparently dates from the time of the Pontifex Maximus, P. Mucius. If, as is very likely, Dionysius is here borrowing from Piso, the same reason would hold for his failure to give further identification.⁷

The natural assumption is that these five writers are all referring to the same thing, but some people have thought differently. Kornemann took Cato and Dionysius to be referring to an early edition of

³ *In Aen.* i. 373.

⁴ *Sat.* iii. 2. 17.

⁵ Gellius ii. 28. 6.

⁶ *Rom. ant.* i. 74. 3. In another passage (i. 73. 1) Dionysius mentions *παλαιοὶ λόγοι ἐν ἱεραῖς δέλτοις σωζόμενοι*. This might refer to any pontifical records and neither adds to nor detracts from the present argument. * *Die älteste Form . . .*

⁷ For the derivation of this passage from Piso see O. Leuze, *Die römische Jahrzahl* (Tübingen, 1909), pp. 200 ff.; cf. Kornemann, "Die älteste Form . . .," p. 246. Naturally it was not necessary in any case for Dionysius to mention a Latin name that would convey nothing to his Greek readers.

the annals.⁸ Westrup adopted this view and sought other references to this early edition, until only the *tabula dealbata* of Servius was left to the original tablets.⁹ In this passage of Servius he assumed a distinction between *tabula dealbata* and *annui commentarii*. The latter he recognized as the hypothetical early edition and thus identified them with the *tabula* of Cicero and Cato and the *πῖναξ* of Dionysius. This distinction in Servius is supported by the curious argument that *tabula dealbata* is nowhere called *annalis*.¹⁰ Naturally it is not, for according to Westrup it is nowhere else mentioned. Yet it seems to be called something like *annalis* here; it probably is by Cicero (who, to Westrup, undoubtedly means something else); and certainly it is by Macrobius (ignored by Westrup). The description by Servius so closely matches that by Cicero and Macrobius that it is idle to try to distinguish without compelling reason. The one reason brought forward is that "the certainly few and extremely scant historical notes in the old calendar-tablets" would never fill eighty books.¹¹ This statement itself would seem to require justification, but none is offered.

What evidence have we as to the contents of the tablets? Cicero says "res omnes singulorum annorum"; Cato mentions a number of petty items which a historian would not bother to repeat; Servius says that what was worthy of record was entered "per singulos dies." Further, Cicero and Dionysius are evidence that the eighty books started with the founding of Rome. We have no clue as to the size of the "books." Putting this evidence together, we surely have a picture of a full record of small notices. Even if we do not take literally the "per singulos dies," the type of thing which Cato knew is certainly suited to daily entries rather than a mere selection of important matters. None of these passages would suggest that the entries were "certainly few and extremely scant," or that they would be insufficient to fill eighty books.¹² So we may understand Servius to say that the con-

⁸ "Die älteste Form . . ." *op. cit.*, p. 249. The theory of an early edition was first elaborated by Enmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 517 ff. For other identifications of *ὁ πῖναξ* in Dionysius see Leuze, *op. cit.*, pp. 197 ff.; Westrup, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 33-37.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 36; cf. pp. 37 f., where the argument is applied to prove that Cicero is not referring to the annual tablets.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 36; cf. Enmann, *op. cit.*, p. 525.

¹² Cf. Cichorius, *op. cit.*, cols. 2252-55.

tents of the *tabula dealbata* were known as *annales mazimi*. This leaves us no objection to connecting his *tabula* with those of Cicero and Macrobius. We can assume that all three are describing the tablet on which the Pontifex Maximus kept his record.

Cato and Dionysius are more vague. But it seems impossible to distinguish between Cato's *tabula apud pontificem maximum* and Cicero's *tabula domi* (*proposita*). Westrup finds this sufficient reason for connecting Cicero with an already identified Cato reference.¹³ We may use it to connect Cato with Cicero, already shown to be referring to the annual tablets. Dionysius uses what appears to be a literal translation of either of these and must be referring to the same thing. The references to an early edition have disappeared, but we have five passages instead of one describing the annual tablet.¹⁴

The character of the material contained in the tablets has already been touched on and is scarcely a matter of dispute. Cato's statement is our best evidence, and we almost certainly have examples of this material in Livy.¹⁵ It consisted of the names of magistrates, deaths of priests and choice of successors, prodigies of all kinds, and the expiatory sacrifices, fires, floods, famines, etc. Some mention also was made of matters which historians considered more important—battles, laws, treaties, etc. But it is clear that the typical material was open to the same criticism that Tacitus later made of the *acta diurna urbis*;¹⁶ it was beneath the dignity of history to record. One may easily imagine a Roman historian, anxious to write of the great characters of Roman history, being annoyed to find that the records were full of little but eclipses and famines. Yet in spite of their defects the pontifical tablets supplied a valuable framework for early Roman history, with a reasonably accurate chronology for three hundred years before the first historian. This is in marked contrast to early Greek history.

¹³ *Op. cit.*, p. 36.

¹⁴ The theory of an early edition is not in question at this point; it is merely desired to show that these passages refer not to it but to the original tablets.

¹⁵ Soltau, *Livius' Geschichtswerk* (Leipzig, 1897), pp. 27–33, 85–94; Cichorius, *op. cit.*, col. 2250.

¹⁶ *Ann.* xiii. 31. 1.

II. DATE OF THE EARLIEST PRESERVED TABLETS

We must now ask when these tablets began to be kept. This question is probably incapable of final solution, but again the evidence points unmistakably in one direction. Cicero and Dionysius both imply that the record began with the founding of the city.¹⁷ This legendary date tells us nothing, except that tablets purporting to be a record of that time existed at a later date. More significant is the mention of the eclipse of June 21, 400 B.C., which Cicero says they contained.¹⁸ There is no question of reconciling Cicero's date with this eclipse; he is sixteen days out by our calendar, which is as close as the Roman calendar of that time could be expected to come. Three hundred and fifty-four years after the founding of the city is certainly "about 350."

Yet it has been argued that it is a later eclipse that is here referred to.¹⁹ This cannot be related to the text of Cicero, and the extensive emendation required is purely gratuitous without external evidence to support it. On such a principle we might as well throw away our one piece of evidence. Hence we may infer from the mention of this eclipse that authentic records went back at least to 400 B.C.

In support of this there is the statement of Livy.²⁰ He tells us that most public records perished in the sack of Rome by the Gauls in 387 B.C. Presumably reconstruction of the lost records was immediately undertaken, and an eclipse thirteen years earlier would naturally be remembered.²¹ The coincidence of our earliest known record coming from the period when Livy implies that authentic records began points

¹⁷ Cicero *De orat.* ii. 52; Dionys. i. 74. 3.

¹⁸ *De rep.* i. 25; this is Ennius *Ann.* 163 (Vahlen), 166 (Warmington). On the dates see Soltau, *Prolegomena zu einer römischen Chronologie* (Berlin, 1886), pp. 85-107; Enmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 520 ff.; Leuze, *op. cit.*, pp. 300 ff.; Boll, *s.v.* "Finsternisse," *R.-E.*, VI, cols. 2355 f.; Cicero's date is June 5. Considering the eccentricities of the Roman calendar, this is close enough to be considered authentic. He is vague about the year, but cannot be called inaccurate.

¹⁹ Gelzer (*op. cit.*, p. 51, n. 2), following K. J. Beloch (*Griechische Geschichte*, IV, Abt. 2 [Berlin, 1927], 267-70), identifies it with an eclipse on June 13, 288 B.C. He admits that emendation is necessary and suggests reading "quinquagesimo CCCC" in the text of Cicero. This still does not bring it anywhere near 288 B.C., which would necessitate altering *quinquagesimo*. The manuscript is admittedly uncertain in the matter of the hundreds, but we must suppose the scribe who corrected it had some basis for the figure he put in. It would be a strange coincidence if he came so close to a prominent eclipse by pure accident.

²⁰ vi. 1. 1-3; Plut. *Numa* 1.

²¹ Livy vi. 1. 10.

to the beginning of the fourth century B.C. as the date for the earliest preserved tablets. Livy is explicit when he says under 389 (387 B.C.): "Clariora deinceps certioraque ab secunda origine velut ab stirpibus laetius feraciusque renatae urbis gesta domi militiaeque exponentur."²²

The later collection went back to the founding of the city. Undoubtedly the material included was largely legendary, but we must not exclude the possibility of much that was authentic being thus preserved. All records were not lost in 387 B.C.,²³ and the memory of men whose business was to know matters like legal and religious precedents was not entirely unreliable. To this must be added the kernel of truth contained in most of the legends. But on the evidence at our disposal we cannot assume that the pontifices had any of these annual tablets older than those of about 400 B.C.

On the basis of a later passage in Livy it has been argued that the pontifical annals did not begin until the third century B.C.²⁴ Under 322 B.C. he found a discrepancy concerning the two questions why a dictator was elected and who celebrated a triumph in that year over the Samnites, and he adds: "Nec quisquam aequalis temporibus illis scriptor extat, quo satis certo auctore stetur." A similar discrepancy over the functions of a dictator is found in Livy himself in 203 B.C.²⁵ If the pontifical records had full information on this subject, Livy had no excuse for uncertainty. But we cannot assume that they would have solved all such problems. In any case Livy for some reason seems to have been content with secondary authorities. His own explicit statement, quoted above, must have more weight than an isolated instance of a lack of contemporary evidence.

Another reason advanced for placing the date of the earliest tablets in the third century is that Julius Obsequens began his list of prodigies

²² *Ibid.*, 1. 3. Dionysius (i. 74. 4) implies that the sack of Rome by the Gauls in 387 was the earliest date in Roman history reached by direct knowledge; for the earlier period calculation was necessary.

²³ See Cichorius, *op. cit.*, col. 2252; L. G. Roberts, "The Gallie Fire and Roman Archives," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, II (1918), 55-65; T. Frank, "Roman Buildings of the Republic," *Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome*, III (1924), 81 ff.

²⁴ viii. 40. 5; Gelzer, *op. cit.*, pp. 50 f.

²⁵ xxx. 24. 3; 26. 12; cf. *CIL*, I, 1, p. 23; Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, II (3d ed.; 1887), 155 f.

in 249 B.C.²⁶ These are typical pontifical material; therefore, the date of their first appearance in Livy, and hence in Obsequens, must be the date of the earliest extant tablet. Whatever may have been Livy's motive for including a list of prodigies in his history at this time, we cannot assume that it was because the pontifical tablets began then. There are some prodigies mentioned earlier, but more noticeable is the other typical pontifical material, which may be found regularly after 387 B.C.²⁷ In the extant books after 218, when there is no question of the pontifical record being available, "typical material" appears and disappears from year to year for no apparent reason. Even the prodigies are occasionally missing. Thus no safe conclusions can be drawn from Livy's omission of such matters. We should pay attention rather to what is there. This will point clearly to the beginning of the fourth century as the time when his sources underwent a marked change. When Dionysius picks the same date as a starting-point for calculations back to earlier history,²⁸ and when Plutarch tells us that a certain Clodius stated that authoritative records began at that time,²⁹ we may feel reasonably certain that it was an important one for Roman records. These indications, coupled with Cicero's date for the eclipse, make the beginning of the fourth century the most probable date for the start of a continuous series of preserved tablets in the keeping of the Pontifex Maximus.

There is no good reason for supposing that they failed to survive until the time of P. Mucius. Two fires are recorded as occurring in the Regia, where they were kept, but no mention is made of the loss of records.³⁰ The first was in 210 B.C., but the preservation of the notice

²⁶ Soltau, *Röm. Geschichtschreibung*, pp. 10-16. For a suggestion as to why these might have become prominent at this time see J. Bernays, "Vergleichung der Wunder in den römischen Annalen," *Rhein. Mus.*, XII (1857), 436-38.

²⁷ Such as accounts of the census and the founding of colonies (cf. Enmann, *op. cit.*, p. 521; G. De Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani*, I [Turin, 1907] 16-21). Similar material is of course found before 387. But it is not quite so regular in appearance, and there are uncertainties even over the magistrates for some years. In dealing with this early period the likelihood of natural decay, without the intervention of fires, must be taken into account. Unless care was taken to renew old records, they would in time become wholly or partly illegible. Writers who disliked prodigies would scarcely go to the labor of deciphering them from old records.

²⁸ i. 74. 4.

²⁹ Numa 1. 1.

³⁰ Livy xxvi. 27. 3; Julius Obsequens 19; *P. Oxy.*, IV, 668, ll. 127 f.; Roberts, *op. cit.*, pp. 59 f.; F. R. Brown, "The Regia," *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, XII (1935), 67-88.

of the eclipse shows that the tablets were not lost before the Romans began to write their history. The second fire in 148 B.C. was more serious, but by this time the contents of the tablets were known and largely recorded elsewhere.³¹ If the passage in Dionysius is properly to be derived from Piso, we have Cato before and Piso after the fire apparently referring to the same thing.³² The publication of the *Annales Maximi* about twenty years later included material from the earliest period. Reconstruction at a date when the tradition was common knowledge would be pointless and, to be convincing, would be difficult. The existence of material for eighty books in 130 B.C. implies little or no loss at this time. Thus we may conclude that there was a continuous and unimpaired record at least from 400 B.C. to the time of P. Mucius.

III. REDACTIONS OF THE ANNALS

There remains the question of the redaction and publication of the material. The natural assumption is that the first and only publication was by P. Mucius Scaevola toward the end of the second century B.C.³³ But various scholars since Mommsen have brought forward a theory of an earlier edition.³⁴ The latest defense of this is by Westrup,

³¹ It is scarcely necessary to enlarge on the fact that the earliest part of later extant pontifical annals was older than the first Roman historians (cf. Cicero *De leg.* i. 6; Quintilian *Inst. or.* x. 2. 7; *Hist. Aug. Tacit.* i. 1). For Cato's knowledge of them see Gellius ii. 28. 6; Kornemann, "Die älteste Form . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 246 f.

³² Dionysius i. 74. 3; see above, n. 7. Gelzer (*op. cit.*, pp. 52 f.) disputes the derivation of this passage from Piso.

³³ Cf. Cichorius, *op. cit.*, col. 2251. The evidence for even this publication is slight, consisting of the passages from Cicero and Servius quoted in Sec. I. The most we know is that the series stopped with P. Mucius and that the accumulated material formed eighty "books."

³⁴ Mommsen (*Römische Geschichte*, I [8th ed.], 464 f.) suggested a date at the end of the fourth century. O. Seeck (*Die Kalendertafel der Pontifices* [Berlin, 1885], pp. 74 ff.) supposed a number of redactions between the Gallic fire and Mucius. Enmann (*op. cit.*, pp. 517 ff.) placed the first redaction in the middle of the third century with Ti. Coruncanius as the man responsible. Kornemann ("Die älteste Form . . .," *op. cit.*) agreed with Enmann. Westrup (*op. cit.*, pp. 31-41) followed Enmann and Kornemann as to the date. On the other hand, this theory has not found general acceptance; Cichorius (*op. cit.*, col. 2255) rejected it, as did De Sanctis (*op. cit.*, pp. 16-21). E. Pais (*Storia critica di Roma*, I, Part I [Rome, 1913], 52-74) rejected a redaction before the second century B.C. But he credited P. Mucius with a fanciful piece of writing and would continue the process of elaboration to the time of Julius Caesar. His evidence was drawn mainly from Greece and the modern world; there is no need to examine this theory further.

who goes further and regards the *annales maximi* themselves "not as a mere later edition of the pontifical annals but as an extensive publication of all pontifical archive-material."³⁵ The arguments for this sweeping revision of the accepted account are not convincing.

The principal reasons adduced in favor of this earlier edition are three: (1) apparently already in Cato's day the pontifical annals included the story of the founding of Rome; (2) the *annales maximi* were too bulky to be derived entirely from the annual tablets and by their very title *maximi* suggest a second and enlarged edition; and (3) the language of Cicero and Quintilian seems to refer to *annales* that must be earlier than those of Scaevola.

1. There is some doubt about the account of the founding of Rome being included in Cato's day, but we may grant that it was there in the time of Piso.³⁶ Does this prove a redaction of all the material? We saw that some reconstruction of earlier records probably began immediately after the Gauls left Rome. There was certainly at some time a considerable amount of legendary material thus included in the record. Various reasons could be advanced to explain these additions to existing records; a desire for a complete chronology and for legal and religious precedents from a venerable past were probably important. To obtain these there was no need to do anything to existing records. Wooden tablets were the common medium for preserving documents in the early Republic,³⁷ and it was necessary only to add to the existing collection. Any attempt to put a definite date to this extension of the record back into a legendary past is almost bound to meet with failure.³⁸ It presumably began with the keeping of records. When the first annalists were writing, about 200 B.C., there was no agreement as

³⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

³⁶ Dionysius i. 74. 3; Kornemann, "Die älteste Form . . .," *op. cit.*, pp. 245 ff. But in Cato's day Ennius had a widely different idea of the date of Rome's foundation (*Ann.*, 501-2[V], 468-69[W]). This would be strange if the pontifical record contained an indication of the date.

³⁷ Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, I, 255-57; A. O'Brien-Moore, *s.v.* "Senatus Consultum," *R.-E.*, Suppl. VI, cols. 805 f. Kornemann ("Die älteste Form . . .," *op. cit.*, p. 254) distinguishes the displayed tablet from those forming a codex; there seems no reason for this.

³⁸ There is no evidence that Ti. Coruncanius did anything to the *annales*, yet his is the one name so far connected with any early edition. Seeck's theory of a series of redactions seems closer to the truth; but why any redactions?

to the date of the founding of Rome.³⁹ This seems to indicate clearly that the process was not yet complete. But to suppose any redaction of the authentic material took place while the legendary record was being developed is quite unnecessary. Fabius Pictor, Ennius, Cato, Piso, or anyone else, could as easily read the original wooden tablets as any new version by some imaginary editor.

2. The bulk of the *annales maximi* has already been discussed.⁴⁰ It is strange that Westrup should find the word *maximi* an additional argument for an earlier edition, while passing over the implications of *annales* in the same title.⁴¹ *Annales* cannot be understood to include all the varied pontifical archive-material, nor does *maximi* readily suggest a comparison with an earlier edition. In three of the four passages where the origin of the name is discussed it is applied to the tablets themselves or, as Westrup would say, to the earlier edition.⁴² It is most natural to understand the epithet as distinguishing these public annals from those of private writers.

3. The third principal argument, that the language of Cicero and Quintilian implies an edition earlier than the work of Fabius Pictor, seems to rest on the assumption that the *annales maximi* were not simply a publication of existing records but a complete re-writing of them. The passage in Cicero runs as follows:

Nam post annalis pontificum maximorum, quibus nihil potest esse iucundius,⁴³ si aut ad Fabium aut ad eum, qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut

³⁹ Dionysius i. 74. 1-2; cf. Ennius *Ann.* 501-2(V), 468-69(W). A discrepancy of a few years was still possible when Livy was writing; surely proof that on this point at least the pontifical annals had never the authority that belongs to a sole existing version.

⁴⁰ See above, p. 377.

⁴¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

⁴² Cicero *De orat.* ii. 52; Servius *In Aen.* i. 373; Macrobius *Sat.* iii. 2. 17; cf. Festus *ap. Paul.*, p. 113(L). The Roman etymology has been questioned by Seeck, *op. cit.*, p. 86. Granting the uncertainty of the Romans in this field, we should at least give some weight to what Cicero understood the epithet *maximi* to convey. He and the later writers consistently regard it as distinguishing the annals of the Pontifex, not a particular edition of those annals.

⁴³ This is the reading of the manuscripts; most editors print Ursinus' emendation *ieiunius*. This is probably correct, but Westrup apparently forgot that it was just an emendation in his discussion of this passage. We might observe also that Cicero in this passage could very easily call even the elaborate figment of Westrup's imagination *ieiuni*.

ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Vennonium venias, quamquam ex his alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes?⁴⁴

And Quintilian says:

Quid erat futurum, si nemo plus effecisset eo quem sequebatur? Nihil in poetis supra Livium Andronicum, nihil in historiis supra pontificum annales haberemus.⁴⁵

Westrup comments on the Cicero passage that it

seems to prove very clearly that *annales pontificum maximorum* can here mean neither *annales maximi*, which were later than Fabius and could not have been termed *ieiunius* by Cicero, nor the old annual calendar-tablet, *tabula dealbata*, which is nowhere called *annalis* and which Cicero does not once mention, but must be the *tabula domi* [*proposita*], of which he speaks in his *annalium confectio* in *de oratore*.⁴⁶

We have already seen that *tabula dealbata* is called *annalis* and is in fact the *tabula domi* [*proposita*] mentioned by Cicero in the *De oratore*. Further, if the *annales maximi* were simply the annual tablets in published form, as Cicero, Servius, and Macrobius all explicitly state,⁴⁷ the older part at least would be correctly described as the earliest Roman historical writing. Westrup has produced three different things where there is in reality only one. We must understand Cicero and Quintilian to be referring here to the current edition of the pontifical annals, of which the oldest part was written before the time of Fabius, that is the *annales maximi*.

Of Westrup's theory that the *annales maximi* were not *annales* but a collection of antiquarian lore⁴⁸ little need be said. He evolved it to explain to himself why P. Mucius published the annals. It is an odd explanation, which implies that the annals did not need publishing but that the rest of the material did. So he published all under the name *annales*. Westrup, however, has three quotations from this extraneous material in the *annales maximi*. Cicero quotes *annalium monumenta* as the source for a legal precedent from the regal period;⁴⁹ he also

⁴⁴ *De leg.* i. 6.

⁴⁵ x. 2. 7.

⁴⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 37.

⁴⁷ Cicero *De orat.* ii. 58; Servius *In Aen.* i. 373; Macrobius *Sat.* iii. 2. 17.

⁴⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 41-45. That the annals were to be distinguished from the other material is told us explicitly by Porphyrio (*In Hor. epist.* ii. 1. 26).

⁴⁹ *Pro Rab. perd.* 15.

quotes *annales publici* as a source for information on Numa's philosophical leanings;⁵⁰ and Gellius quotes the *annales maximi* for a story about Etruscan *haruspices* and a *senarius* composed on the occasion.⁵¹ Gellius almost certainly read only Verrius Flaccus for his quotation, and we need not believe that the pontifical annals had anything more than a reference to the *haruspices*. This was typical material from the annals, connected as it was with the expiation of a prodigy. The two Cicero references, if he does mean the *annales maximi*, are from the regal period, when the annals had been expanded with all sorts of information. A legal precedent is what we might expect to find; it is implied that the required information about Numa was in fact not to be found in the one reasonably reliable source for that early period. It cannot be too strongly emphasized that indications as to the character of the material contained in what must have been reconstructed tablets should not be applied to the period from which tablets were preserved. Certainly these passages do not prove that the *annales maximi* were anything but a copy of the annual tablets.

The involved theories concerning these annals have all resulted from the assumption of an early redaction. Since there appears to be no evidence for anything of the sort, we may return to the natural interpretation of our limited sources. The conclusions we have reached are briefly as follows. The Pontifex Maximus kept each year a day-to-day record of events on a wooden tablet. The preserved records began at least as early as 400 B.C. Additions dealing with the earlier period were made, probably gradually. The tablets were kept in the Regia in sufficient order for a man like Cato to consult. The record was continued until the time of P. Mucius, when it was given a final shape, probably by publication. There is no evidence for an earlier edition, and what we know as the *annales maximi* was not a fuller, and so less reliable, edition but simply a copy of the tablets themselves. The same unadulterated material was available to Cicero, Quintilian, and their contemporaries as to the earliest annalists, though perhaps in a more convenient form.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

⁵⁰ *De rep.* ii. 28.

⁵¹ iv. 5; cf. Cichorius, *op. cit.*, col. 2253.

APHRODITE AND ATHENA IN THE *LYSISTRATA* OF ARISTOPHANES

G. W. ELDERKIN

THE novel method by which *Lysistrata* proposes to end the war between the Athenians and the Spartans gives Aphrodite ample opportunity to exercise her spell. The beginning of the comedy, which seems to exclude her from impending developments, is in reality the anacrusis of an erotic theme. *Lysistrata* complains that the women whom she has summoned to the acropolis for a mysterious meeting in the early morning do not come so promptly as they would have to a shrine of Dionysus or Pan, to that (of Aphrodite) at Cape Kolias or of Genetyllis.¹ Vexation, however, does not prevent her from naming the four shrines in their logical sequence. Aphrodite's is mentioned immediately after Pan's in keeping with their close association. They shared an altar at Olympia.² In the Hellenistic period, when sculptors represented Aphrodite with greater license than their predecessors had done, there was set up at Delos an erotic group of the pair.³ In the comedy the sequence Dionysus, Pan, Aphrodite, and Genetyllis simply recognizes the natural sequence of wine, passion, and offspring.

Besides frequent affirmations in the name of Aphrodite, there are implied references to the goddess and her cult which are equally indicative of her significant role in the play. In verse 177 *Lysistrata* announces that the elder women have been ordered to seize the acropolis, and she then invites her followers to take an oath that they will desert their husbands until the latter make peace with the Spartans. The circumstances of the oath are these: a shield is placed "on its back,"⁴ on the ground apparently, and into it the women are, in the words of Aeschylus

¹ Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (*Lysistrata*, p. 122) would strike out ἡ after Κωλιάδ'.

² Pausanias v. 15. 6.

³ The group is now in the National Museum at Athens (Lawrence, *Later Greek Sculpture*, Pl. 63).

⁴ Cf. χαλκόνωτος as an adjective applied to a shield (Eurip. *Tro.* 1136).

lus,⁵ to sacrifice—the audience expected the word *ταυροσφαγείν*, but instead they were surprised to hear *μηλοσφαγούσας*. Rogers suggests that the substitution, if not a mere inadvertence, was due to the double meaning of *ταῦρος* and *μήλον*.⁶ If *μήλο-* is taken in the sense of “apple,” as in verse 155, where the word is used of the breasts of the Spartan Helen,⁷ the substitution is as apt as it is surprising. The followers of Lysistrata are warrior women about to seize the acropolis and beat off the attacks of the men if necessary, but they expect a peaceful victory with the help of Aphrodite. If *μηλοσφαγούσαι* means “sacrificing the apples” (i.e., the “breasts”), then it could allude to such an act as is recorded of a devotee of the Syrian Aphrodite who cut off her breasts and offered them to the goddess.⁸ A possible evidence of such a rite may lie in the Paphian use of a *mastos* or breast-shaped cup.⁹ Since the Phoenician-Paphian Aphrodite had come to Athens long before the days of Aristophanes, a playful reference to a rite as savage as that of the Galli could have been understood by the Athenians in the theater. Kalonike protests that, since the women are in quest of peace, they should not take an oath over a shield (vs. 190). Here again there is a play upon a word. By a metaphor of the comic poets a broad flat dish such as the *phiale* was called a shield. This comparison was facilitated by the occasional use of the round shield (*στάκος*) as a container of a blood offering.¹⁰ Lysistrata’s order to place a shield “on its back” and to use it as a sacrificial vessel in the administration of an oath is quite in keeping with the character of her Amazonians. Since they are on the field of action, a shield might serve the purposes of a sacrificial vessel as it probably did on occasion before or after a real battle.

Kalonike proposes that the victim which is to furnish the *τόμια* for the oath be a white horse, whereupon Lysistrata asks the reason for such a choice.¹¹ Kalonike does not satisfy Lysistrata’s curiosity, but

⁵ *Septem* 43.

⁶ *Lysistrata*, p. 25.

⁷ Helen is considered an Amazon by Vürtheim (*Mnemosyne* [1902], p. 276).

⁸ Cf. Florence M. Bennett (Anderson), *AJA*, 1912, p. 487.

⁹ Hesychius s.v. *μαστός*; Athen. 487b.

¹⁰ Aeschylus, *Septem* 43. Pausanias (v. 10. 4) quotes an inscription on a shield (*ἀσπίς*) which he saw over the gable of the temple of Zeus at Olympia. This inscription calls the shield a *φιάλη*.

¹¹ The scholiast suggests a reference to the sacrifice of white horses by the Amazons. An Amazon rides one in a Greek painting on an Etruscan sarcophagus (*Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1883, Pl. 36).

perhaps the audience was reminded of the importance of the white horse in Spartan cult. Tyndareus, standing upon the *τόμια* of a horse which he had sacrificed, administered an oath to the suitors of Helen. Pausanias saw the tomb of this horse but does not tell the color of the animal.¹² The Tyndaridai, Castor and Pollux, by whom the Spartan Lampito swears (vs. 81), were called *λεύκιπποι*, while the sisters whom they seized bore the title *Λευκίππιδες* at Sparta.¹³ Since the followers of Lysistrata desire peace with the Spartans, a reference to a Spartan sacrifice of a horse which obliged those taking the oath to come to the aid of Helen and her husband would be particularly appropriate in view of Lysistrata's plan to get the collaboration of the Spartan women. If the Tyndaridai or the sons of Zeus are here involved, then the ensuing affirmation of Myrrhina "by Zeus" is logical enough. Myrrhina now proposes that a large black cylix be placed "on its back"—she is speaking in terms of a shield—and that there be "slaughtered" over it a jar of Thasian wine. In the figurative phrase *μηλοσφαγῶσαι*¹⁴ *θάσιον οἶνον σταμνίον*, where the wine jar is the victim the blood of which is to be let out, there is perhaps a play upon the similar word *ἀμνίον*, a bowl in which the blood of victims was caught.¹⁵ The Spartan Lampito approves of this oath heartily, perhaps in opposition to the proposal by Kalonike that a white horse be sacrificed.

When a cylix and *stamnion* have been brought out, Lysistrata orders Kalonike to hold the boar (vs. 202) by which she means the *stamnion*. The name "boar" for a wine jar was not without justification. An animal skin and possibly that of a boar was used to contain wine from the days of Homer at least. Later the *askos* was "translated" into clay. To open the neck of such a wineskin and let its content flow into a wine cup or cylix was to slash the throat of a sacrificial victim and let its blood spurt out. The cylix is a shield and the wine blood. The warrior women are simulating a blood offering on the field of battle. Apart from the semantic appropriateness of calling a *stamnion* a boar, there was another reason for the name. Adonis, the be-

¹² iii. 20. 9.

¹³ The Meidias painter represents the seizure in the presence of Aphrodite while Peitho departs hastily (Furtwängler-Reichhold, *Griech. Vasenmalerei*, Taf. 9).

¹⁴ This word occurs elsewhere in the sense of "sacrifice of sheep."

¹⁵ *Odyssey* iii. 444.

loved of Aphrodite, was slain by the boar which the jealous Ares sent against him.¹⁶ The appeal to Peitho (vs. 203) to receive the boar's blood was tantamount to an invocation of Aphrodite because of their close association in cult on the west slope of the acropolis somewhere near the bastion of the temple of Nike¹⁷ and apparently not far from the place where the followers of Lysistrata were assembled.¹⁸ One tradition made Peitho, who was but an emanation of Aphrodite, a daughter of the goddess. In the theater Aphrodite and Peitho may both have been represented by statues as was Peace in the comedy of that name. Rogers suggests that their temple was in full view. The nearness of the sanctuaries of Aphrodite, Peitho, and Nike was a fortunate coincidence for Lysistrata, who hoped to gain a victory with the help of Aphrodite and her daughter. This hope is reflected in the name of Kalonike, which is as deliberately chosen as the names used by the Meidias painter, who was a contemporary of Aristophanes.

The proximity of Lysistrata and her women to the Propylaea explains perhaps a curious detail of the oath which she administers to Kalonike on behalf of all the women in order to insure the success of her program of unqualified continence: *οὐ στήσομαι Λέαν' ἐπὶ τυροκνήστιδος* (vs. 231). A bronze statue of a lioness stood in or near the east colonnade of the gateway and beside a statue of Aphrodite, where it had been set up by the Athenians in memory of Leaina, the mistress of Aristogeiton.¹⁹ She had been tortured to death by Hippias, who suspected her of knowing that his brother would be slain. Later in the comedy the chorus of old men refers to the statue of Aristogeiton in the city (vs. 633). Lysistrata, in saying "I shall not stand a lioness upon . . .," led the audience to expect some phrase which would have identified the animal with the Lioness par excellence of the Propylaea but instead substitutes a word for cheese-grater. This gives a totally different meaning to the verse which Jacobstal has probably

¹⁶ Later in the comedy the wailing for Adonis is mentioned (vs. 389).

¹⁷ Pausanias i. 22. 3.

¹⁸ Cf. Rogers, *op. cit.*, p. xl. The women hear the shout of their elder comrades who have seized the acropolis (vss. 241-42) and then themselves enter the Propylaea to help in barring its gates.

¹⁹ Pausanias i. 23. 2.

correctly interpreted.²⁰ It is possible that at the foot of the bronze Leaina of the Propylaea there was represented a carding²¹ or grating instrument in allusion to the kind of torture which Leaina suffered, but just what torture Hippias prescribed is not known. Jacobstal's interpretation of the schema is favored by the context. In the preceding verse the gaze of the woman is toward the ceiling, while in this it is toward the floor. Leaina perhaps owed her name, which was given to other women of her sort, to the lionesses of Cybele as a deity of fertility. It may have been a title in origin like the "bulls" of Poseidon and the "bears" of Artemis. Allusion to statuary is to be expected of Aristophanes, who had an eye for art. In verse 1094 the distressed men are warned they may suffer the fate of the *Hermiai* at the hands of the *Hermokopidai*.

Aphrodite and Peitho, upon whom Lysistrata depends, are set over against Athena, the especial deity of the elders who hasten to the acropolis to prevent the women from seizing the holy image of the virgin goddess (vs. 262). These old men are as conspicuous in the comedy as they are in the east frieze of the Parthenon, where they likewise hold Athena in honor. Lysistrata has hardly stated her resolution to hold the Propylaea against the old men even though they come with fire, and Kalonike has hardly seconded the resolution in the name of Aphrodite, saying that otherwise the women would be called *ἄμαχοι*, when the elders appear (vs. 254). They invoke Herakles because the fire which they carry in a pot attacks them like a raging dog (Kerberos) and bites their eyes (vss. 296-300), thus indicating that, as the hero brought up the dog of Hades, so they bring up its biting fire. This fire is Lemnian, i.e., the fire of Hephaistos. By such means the women are to be driven from the citadel of Athena. Quite apart from the pun on *Λήμνιον*, there was a decided appropriateness in using the fire of Hephaistos because of his intimate relation to the goddess. His fire is to come to her aid. Hephaistos sat beside her both in the east frieze of the Parthenon and in his own temple in the lower city.²²

²⁰ *Athen. Mitt.*, 1932, pp. 1-7. A well-preserved cheese-grater from Ialysos is pictured in Abb. 1. Its rasping surface is formed by perforations through the bronze plate. The handle, however, consists of a plain flat strip of metal.

²¹ Cf. *κνάφος* (*κνάω*).

²² When the Athenian colonists to Lemnos set up on the acropolis a statue of Athena, they were inviting the protection of Hephaistos as well as that of the Parthenos.

The appeal of the women to Athena as the goddess of the golden crest (vs. 344) refers to the Phidian statue in the Parthenon. It is more serious than the second appeal to her, under the title of Tritogeneia, to join the women in carrying water if the men should endeavor to burn them. She is called the daughter of Triton because he was a god of stream or lake. More obviously playful allusions to Athena are made by the women when, irked by their isolation on the citadel of the goddess, they offer various excuses for leave to rejoin their husbands (vss. 726 ff.). One pleads that she is about to become a mother (vs. 742), but the apparent evidence of her condition proves to be a holy helmet of bronze concealed beneath her dress. When asked to explain its presence there, the woman asserts that if birth pangs had seized her on the acropolis she would have entered into the helmet to give birth to her child like the doves (vs. 755). The sacred helmet par excellence on the acropolis was that of Athena. Since it was bronze and had to be large enough for the woman to enter, the poet must have had in mind the colossal bronze statue of the Promachos which stood conspicuously on the acropolis.²³ It is conceivable that the woman's makeup afforded sufficient justification for the poet's hyperbole. With the references to the Promachos, the Parthenos, and the *βπέρας* (vs. 262), the poet has alluded in one comedy to the three most important statues of Athena on the acropolis. For the primitive image in the Erechtheion a *peplos* was woven which inspired Lysistrata's *chlaina* for the Demos (vss. 574-86).²⁴ Another woman wishes to go home because she cannot sleep after seeing the house-watching snake of the acropolis (vs. 759). When Pausanias saw it coiled within the shield of the Phidian Parthenos, he cited the tradition that it was Erichthonios. This snake, which Athena let Ge bear as the child of Hephaistos, brings the goddess to mind, as do the owls which kept another of Lysistrata's followers awake all night (vs. 760). The owl was Athena's attribute and the city's emblem. In these allusions it is not the goddess but her attributes which provoke a smile.²⁵ For Athena the women show re-

²³ Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (*op. cit.*, p. 168) notes that many helmets are listed among the treasures of the goddess.

²⁴ Since Demos is masculine, he receives a man's *chlaina*, not the *peplos* which was worn by women.

²⁵ Cf. A. Couat, *Aristophane et l'ancienne comédie attique* (1889), p. 237.

spect, as when they mention their service in her priesthood as *arrephoroi*.²⁶

Besides the women who request leaves of absence, there are others who try to escape from the acropolis. Lysistrata caught one at an opening into the little court of Pan (vs. 721). The close association of Pan with Aphrodite has already been remarked. Another woman sought to fly from the citadel on the back of a bird called *στρουθός*. Since this bird also drew the car of Aphrodite,²⁷ the goddess and Pan are brought together again as they are in the opening scene of the comedy. The motif of a devotee of Aphrodite mounted upon a bird, which Wilamowitz-Moellendorff dismisses with "Die lustige Erfindung genügt,"²⁸ may have been suggested to Aristophanes by the art of his own city. In an Athenian cylix of the fifth century Aphrodite is represented as riding on the back of a swan or goose.²⁹ Lysistrata prevented the escape of the woman by dragging her from her mount by the hair. This may also be a playful appropriation of an artistic motif of the time. In the frieze of the temple at Bassai an Amazon is dragged from her mount by the hair. Since Lysistrata's women are warlike, the motif is a happy one, the more so because in classical art only Amazons are so represented. The chorus of old men prepared the audience for such implied comparison by saying a few verses previously that, if the women take to horses, the Athenian knights will be crossed off the list for the reason that woman is *ἰπποκώτατον*, in proof of which contention the chorus cites the paintings by Mikon at Athens of Amazons on horseback fighting men, i.e., Athenians (vss. 676-79).³⁰ Lysistrata had

²⁶ They cite also their service as *kanephoroi* (in the Panathenaia) when they carried a string of dried figs. (vss. 646-47). This is of interest in the light of a passage in the *Haliæus* of Lucian (47), where Parrhesiades asks the priestess (of Athena) for figs and gold with which to bait his hook for the philosophers below the wall of the acropolis. He was asking for what she had with her. The *kanephoroi*, like the *arrephoroi*, probably wore also pieces of gold (cf. *Etym. Mag.*, p. 149).

²⁷ Sappho i. 10.

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 167.

²⁹ Murray, *White Athenian Vases*, Pl. XV; Diepolder, *Der Penthesilcia Meister*, Taf. 5.

³⁰ The close interrelation of relief sculpture and painting at this time favors the assumption that the picture by Mikon contained among other conventional combat motifs that of an Athenian dragging an Amazon by the hair from her horse. It survives on sarcophagi of Roman date. In tragedy a woman is frequently seized by the hair but not dragged from a horse by that means.

also previously referred to her four companies of armed fighting women (vs. 454), calling them *ξύμμαχοι* and ordering them not to plunder (vs. 461). There are other instances of the indebtedness of the poet to the art of his time and city. The plan of the women to seize the men by the leg and dash them headlong (vs. 705) reminds one of an Athenian vase painting in which Neoptolemos seizes Astyanax by the ankle to dash the life out of him.³¹ Again, when the chorus of men appeals to Nike to grant a *tropaion* after the defeat of the women (vs. 316), Aristophanes had in mind the recently carved frieze of the balustrade of the temple of Nike, below which the men passed on their way to the Propylaea. In this frieze winged Victories set up trophies.³² Such intention would give a comic turn to the command to Nikodike to fly, since the first part of her name is Nike (vs. 321).

When the abstemious program of Lysistrata has been in operation for some time, a man is seen approaching the acropolis who is so successfully under the spell of Aphrodite that one invokes the goddess as queen of Cyprus, Cythera, and Paphos (vs. 833).³³ This invocation, which culminates in the mention of Paphos, where the cult of Aphrodite was erotic enough, is immediately followed by the recognition of the man as Kinesias, the husband of Myrrhina (vs. 838). Her name was purposely chosen by the poet. Myrrhina means "myrtle," which was sacred to Aphrodite. It was also the name of an Amazon queen who perhaps shared it with the town Myrina in Lemnos.³⁴ When Myrrhina attributed her delay in joining Lysistrata to the loss of her girdle (vs. 72), the audience may have been reminded of an Amazon queen, Hippolyta, who also lost her girdle. Since the Aphrodite of Paphos was a goddess in whose service there were many harlots, it is not surprising that the name Myrrhina was given to *hetairai*. Kinesias proposes that his wife Myrrhina join him in the sanctuary of Pan (vs. 911), the very place which one of the deserting women tried to reach. The goatish Pan is thus again brought to notice in an erotic situation, as he is when he is blamed for the plight of the male Spar-

³¹ Furtwängler-Reichhold, *op. cit.*, Pl. 25.

³² Cf. Dinsmoor, *AJA*, 1926, p. 23, on the number.

³³ Cf. vss. 551 and 556, where the same sequence occurs. On the antiquity of the cult of Aphrodite at Paphos see Westholm, *Acta Arch.*, 1933, p. 201.

³⁴ Pliny *N.H.* iv. 12 (23).

tans (vs. 998). Myrrhina asks her husband how she can return pure to the acropolis. He bids her wash in the spring Klepsydra. This was a travesty of a bath given Aphrodite. Her priestess at Sicyon bore the title Loutrophoros,³⁵ which can only mean that she brought water to bathe the image of the goddess in her temple. The same rite obtained at Athens. An inscription discovered in a wall of the Beulé gate,³⁶ and therefore near the site where Pausanias recorded a sanctuary of Aphrodite and Peitho, mentions the duty of the *astynomoi* to bathe the images of the two goddesses. The bathing of the statue of a goddess is a commemorative re-enactment of the bath which the goddess took herself. Of such there is an actual record for Hera, who annually bathed in the spring of Kanathos and in consequence recovered her virginity.³⁷ One may guess that Praxiteles had the same idea in mind when he represented Aphrodite nude beside a hydria, which in the language of art meant spring. The Aristophanic Myrrhina, who is a parody of Aphrodite, will bathe in the Klepsydra after her meeting with Kinesias in the court of Pan and in consequence will return to the acropolis pure.

The appeal to Eros and Aphrodite Kyprogeneia (vs. 551) to instil desire into the men reminded the Athenian audience of another sanctuary which the two deities shared on the north slope of the acropolis not far from the Erechtheion.³⁸ It was to this sanctuary that the *arrophoroi* apparently descended with their mysterious burden. Toward the end of the comedy (vs. 1182) Lysistrata bids the men purify themselves so that the women may entertain them on the acropolis with what they have in the *kistai*. Since these women had served as *arrophoroi* and *aletrides* (vss. 641-42), their *kistai* may have contained cakes of significant gender, the more so in view of the erotic character of the play. One recalls the Eleusinian formula *ἔλαβον ἐκ κίστης . . . ἀπεθέμην . . . εἰς κίστην*.³⁹ Many of the Athenians had been initiated into the mysteries at Eleusis, and there was an Eleusinion not far from the Propylaea.

³⁵ Pausanias ii. 10. 4.

³⁶ Dittenberger, *Sylloge*,³ 375.

³⁷ Pausanias ii. 38. 2.

³⁸ Cf. Broneer, *Hesperia*, 1935, pp. 123 ff.; *AJA*, 1940, p. 255.

³⁹ Clem. Alex. *Protrep.* 18. Cf. Deubner, *Attische Feste*, pp. 79 ff.

The Erechtheion is not mentioned by name in the comedy, but there are various references to it. The holy image of Athena, which the men are determined to save, was housed in that temple. When Poseidon is invoked under the title 'Αλυκός (vs. 403), the Athenians with the word ἀλυκίς ("salt spring") in mind could easily have thought of the "sea" of Poseidon in the western part of the Erechtheion.⁴⁰ A few verses later (vs. 439) one of the women warns the Proboulos that, if he even touches Lysistrata, he will, by Pandrosos, have something trampled out of him. This unusual appeal to Pandrosos acquires decided point if in her inclosure, the Pandroseion, there were penned on occasion the oxen of Boutes, whose altar was in the Erechtheion. Animals were kept in the Homeric "court," which had an altar of Zeus Herkeios as did the Pandroseion,⁴¹ while the olive in the *herkos* of Odysseus was matched by that in the *herkos* of Pandrosos. Proboulos then is threatened with the fate of the Milesian children who were trampled to death by oxen.⁴²

A further allusion to the temple may lie in the means of escape from the acropolis which one of the women tried. She wriggled down a rope attached to a pulley (vs. 722). Since the comedy was produced in 411, the idea may have been suggested to Aristophanes by a derrick set up on the north wall near the Erechtheion which was still unfinished. The poet could have seen some kind of hoisting device the rope of which dangled outside the wall. When Parrhesiades fishes from the north(?) wall of the acropolis,⁴³ Philosophy asks him whether he means to fish up stones from the Pelargikon. Perhaps Lucian and Aristophanes both derived their playful ideas from a hoisting rope. The suggestion of the scholiast that in the comedy the reference is to a well-rope is open to the objection that the escape requires some means of descent outside the walls of the acropolis.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

⁴⁰ Wilamowitz-Moellendorf (*op. cit.*, p. 148) believes that the title can refer only to ἐνεουρηκότας (vs. 402).

⁴¹ The names of Pandrosos and her sister Herse may both have been derived from the words δρόσοι and ἑρσαι in the sense "young animals."

⁴² Athen. 524a.

⁴³ Lucian *Haliens* 47.

ERASMUS' TRANSLATION OF LUCIAN'S *LONGAevi*

C. R. THOMPSON

I

IT IS well known to students of Erasmus that the great humanist admired the works of Lucian and that he translated and borrowed from some of them. In the early years of the sixteenth century, Erasmus, who was then living in Paris, began to read Lucian in Greek and to make Latin versions of his writings as a means of improving his meager knowledge of the Greek tongue;¹ he was forced to be his own teacher in those days, he tells us, because of the paucity of competent teachers of Greek.² As he read, he became attracted to Lucian for another reason: his merits as an amusing and stimulating critic of the follies and credulity of mankind. Lucian, according to Erasmus, might be read with much profit by people of modern times, even by philosophers and theologians, for they needed his counsels of temperance and tolerance quite as badly as their predecessors in Lucian's day had needed them.³

In order to entertain and instruct the reading public, and also to encourage the study of Greek,⁴ Erasmus published many Latin translations of Lucian.⁵ These translations were popular enough to command not fewer than forty printings between 1506 and 1550. It was partly because of them that Lucian became a favorite author in Erasmus' generation. It was partly because of them, and of the Lucianic temper of *Moriae encomium* and of some of the *Colloquia*,

¹ *Opus epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami*, ed. P. S. Allen [et H. M. Allen et H. W. Garrod] (Oxford, 1906—), I, 7, 25—8, 6. I shall refer to this work as *EE* by volume, page, and line; if only volume and page are given, the editor's introduction on the page cited is meant.

In Latin quotations and citations in this paper, I use *i* for vowel and consonant *i*, *u* for vowel *u*, and *v* for consonant *u*.

² *Ibid.*, I, 7, 19—24.

³ *Ibid.*, II, 503, 5—9.

⁴ Cf. *ibid.*, I, 8, 10—13.

⁵ My monograph on these, *The Translations of Lucian by Erasmus and St. Thomas More*, will appear soon.

that Erasmus' name was linked by contemporaries with Lucian's; that Luther denounced him as worse than Lucian;⁶ and that the elder Scaliger accused him of being, like Lucian, a mocker of religion.⁷

There is evidence that Erasmus knew the *Vera historia*, in Latin no doubt, as early as 1499.⁸ Four or five years later (the precise date is uncertain) he tried to turn into Latin the pseudo-Lucianic mock-tragedy, *Tragodopodagra*. This attempt he abandoned because of the difficulty of putting the choruses into Latin.⁹ But soon afterward he again turned to Lucian, this time with success. In 1505-6 he translated twenty-eight of Lucian's writings. Some of these translations he made in England, where he lived for most of that year. Associated with him in this pleasant labor of rendering Lucian in Latin was his friend Thomas More, who translated four works, *Cynicus*, *Menippus*, *Philopseudes*, and *Tyrannicida*. *Tyrannicida* was translated also by Erasmus. Both men, moreover, wrote Latin declamations answering the arguments of *Tyrannicida*.

By June, 1514, Erasmus had published translations of thirty-five works of Lucian. Twenty-eight of these, together with the four by More and the two declamations replying to *Tyrannicida*, were brought out by Badius in Paris in November, 1506.¹⁰ Seven additional ones

⁶ D. Martin Luthers Werke (Weimar, 1883—), *Tischreden*, III, 136-37; cf. *Briefwechsel*, V, 88; *EE*, VI, 269, 30-270, 37.

⁷ I. Caes. Scaligeri *Pro M. Tullio Cicerone, contra Desid. Erasmum Roterodamum, Oratio I* (Toulouse, 1620), p. 53. Each of Scaliger's two *orationes* has a separate title-page dated 1620, but the title-page of the volume containing them, *Iul. Caes. Scaligeri adversus Desid. Erasmum orationes duae*, is dated 1621. *Oratio I* was first printed in 1531. Later, Scaliger was of a different opinion (see *EE*, IX, 368).

⁸ *EE*, I, 224, 27-28.

⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 6, 36-7, 19.

¹⁰ *Luciani viri quam disertissimi compluria opuscula longe festivissima ab Erasmo Roterodamo & Thoma moro interpretibus optimis in latinorum linguam traducta. hac sequenter serie. Ex Erasmi interpretatione [...] Tozaris sive de amicitia Luciani dialogus. Alexander qui & Pseudomantis eiusdem. Gallus sive Somnium eiusdem quoque luciani [...] Timon seu Misanthropus. Tyrannicida seu pro tyrannicida eiusdem declamatio. Cum declamatione Erasmica eidem respondente. De iis qui mercede conducti degunt dialogus eiusdem. Et quaedam eiusdem alia [...] Ex Mori traductione. Tyrannicida Luciani Moro interprete. Declamatio Mori de eodem. Cynicus Luciani a Moro versus [...] Menippus seu Necromantia Luciani eodem interprete. Philopseudes seu incredulus Luciani ab eodem Moro in latinam linguam traductus: Ex aedibus Ascensianis (Ph. Renouard, *Bibliographie des impressions et des œuvres de Josse Badius Ascensius* [Paris, 1908], III, 26).*

The above title mentions the names of only ten of the translations of Lucian in the volume. In addition to the six by Erasmus and the four by More that are named, and

appeared in an edition published by Badius in June, 1514.¹¹ These, added to the earlier ones, made a total of thirty-five translations of Lucian published under Erasmus' name. Another translation, the thirty-sixth, which was published under another man's name, is the subject of this paper.

In the famous letter to Botzheim (1523-24), Erasmus gives the names of the Lucianic works he has translated¹² and adds: "Verteramus et Longaevos, dictantes tantum, sed notarius suffuratus libellum Montioio dicatum pro suo aedidit Lutetiae."¹³ Allen was unable to "find any trace of this edition" at the time of the publication of the first volume of his *Erasmi epistolae*.¹⁴ A few weeks before his death (June 16, 1933), however, it turned up. Professor Garrod writes:

Towards the end of April an Erasmian "find" gave him immense pleasure. Mr Falconer Madan had directed his attention to an item in a bookseller's catalogue, which proved to be a unique copy of Erasmus' translation of the *Longaevi* of Lucian. Years back Allen had hunted this book unavailingly. He was now able to secure it.¹⁵

The volume is now in the Bodleian Library.

In other words, we have now to add to the corpus of Erasmus the text of a translation that heretofore was unavailable. For Erasmians the book in which the translation is contained has some further importance because in it Erasmus' *De ratione studii . . . epistola pro-treptica*; *Praeceptiuncula*, *quis sit modus lectionis repetendae*; and a composition entitled *Compendiaria quaedam vitae institutio* were apparently first printed.¹⁶

their two original declamations replying to *Tyrannicida*, the book contains translations by Erasmus of eighteen short dialogues from *Dialogi deorum*, *Dialogi marini*, and *Dialogi mortuorum*, and of *Hercules*, *Eunuchus*, *De sacrificiis*, and *Convivium*.

¹¹ *Luciani Erasmo interprete dialogi & alia emuncta. Quorum quaedam recentius quaedam annos abhinc octo sunt versa: sed nuper recognita: ut indice ad finem apponendo declarabimus. Quedam etiam a Thoma Moro latina facta: & quaedam ab eodem concinnata. Vaenundantur in aedibus Ascensianis* (Renouard, *op. cit.*, III, 27).

The seven additional works translated were: *Saturnalia*, *Cronosolon*, *Epistolae Saturnales*, *De luctu*, *Abdicatus*, *Icaromenippus*, and *De astrologia*.

¹² *EE*, I, 7, 25-8, 6; cf. I, 38, 19-39, 13; VIII, 374, 52-77.

¹³ *Ibid.*, I, 8, 8-10.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 8, 8 n.; cf. I, 442, 57 n.

¹⁵ H. W. Garrod, "Percy Stafford Allen," *Proceedings of the British Academy*, XIX (1933), 406; cf. *EE*, VIII, xix, xxi.

¹⁶ See below, pp. 405-8.

The *notarius* who published the translation without authorization and "pro suo"¹⁷ was Gervasius Amoenus of Dreux; the volume in which it appeared, his *Lucubrationculae*. Of Amoenus little is known.¹⁸ He was a servant-pupil of Erasmus in Paris in the summer of 1506, before Erasmus went to Italy. In a letter to Aldus Manutius, November, 1507, Erasmus relates a trick he had played on Amoenus. He promised the boy, in jest, that some verses composed by him should appear in the volume of translations of Euripides¹⁹ by Erasmus that Badius was about to print, and in fact had given the verses to Badius in Amoenus' presence. But Badius failed to understand Erasmus' meaning or forgot it; at all events, he included the verses in the book.²⁰ Erasmus took care that when the translations were next printed (Venice: Aldus, December, 1507), Amoenus' contribution was excised.

In addition to his *Lucubrationculae*,²¹ Amoenus produced an edition of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica* (Paris: Badius, January, 1512),²² and a poem, *Hoildis* [:] *Ad sanctissimam virginem Hoildim Gervasii Amoeni Drucensis ob recuperatam oculorum sospitatem votitium* [sic] *carmen* . . . (Paris: Badius, April, 1522).²³

A prefatory letter to the edition of Valerius Flaccus indicates that Amoenus spent the years 1505-12 in England.²⁴ Yet it is certain that he was with Erasmus in the summer of 1506.²⁵ Possibly he had accom-

¹⁷ See below, p. 405.

¹⁸ Cf. *EE*, I, 442, 57 n.; P. S. Allen, *Erasmus* (Oxford, 1934), pp. 99-108, 120.

¹⁹ *Hecuba* and *Iphigenia in Aulide*. They were issued in September, 1506.

²⁰ *EE*, I, 442, 56-61; Renouard, *op. cit.*, II, 428.

²¹ This work is not mentioned by Renouard and evidently was unknown to him. Nor is it in the Erasmus bibliographies.

The authorities of the Bodleian Library have kindly furnished me rotographs of the book.

²² Renouard, *op. cit.*, III, 314-15. In some of the older bibliographies (e.g., Panzer and the British Museum *Catalogue*) this edition is given the impossible date 1500. The new British Museum *Catalogue*, s.v. "Amoenus," corrects the date to 1512.

²³ Renouard, *op. cit.*, II, 27.

²⁴ *Non possum non vehementi gaudio perfundi, . . . cum post septennium quod in felici Britannia transegi, bonas artes nunc Parrhisiiis florere videam* . . . (*ibid.*, III, 315). This letter is not noted by Allen. See also below, p. 405.

²⁵ Erasmus (*EE*, I, 442, 59) explicitly says that Amoenus saw him give the verses to Badius.

panied Erasmus across the Channel in 1505 and, after coming to Paris with him a year later, had returned to England when his master departed for Italy. He was at one time a student in the University of Paris, as is attested by his reference to Aegidius Delphus as "*praeceptoris suo*"²⁶ and by the dedication of his *Lucubrationculae*, which was written "*Parisiis ex collegio Narbonensi*."²⁷ One of the works in his volume, an *Oratio suasoria ad capessendas litteras graecas*, is dedicated in cordial terms to the principal of that college.²⁸ In the *Oratio* he refers to Jerome Aleander, who taught in the University of Paris in 1508-10 and 1511-13.²⁹ Amoenus, I suggest, was a student of Aleander's in 1512-13.

In a letter of October 10, 1513, Badius wrote to Michael Hummelberger that he was about to print, among other things,³⁰ *Lucubrationculas non poenitendas Gervasii Chuaeni [sic] discipuli Erasmi nostri cum quibusdam Erasmicis*. . . .³¹ The book itself contains no date; we are, therefore, uncertain whether it was published in 1513 or in the following year.³² The more probable date is 1514.³³

The title-page reads: *Gervasii Amenii drucensis. Lucubrationculae quaedam non invenustae. Hymni panegyrici ad sacrosanctam semperque venerandam Trinitatem tum collectim tum divisim. Odae [sic] in genere demonstrativo; nec non cataplasma elegiacum cum carmine quodam Sapphico ad Virginem Deiparam. Elegiae quum de mutuis inter Christianos bellis tum aliis argumentis. Oratio suasoria ad capescendas litteras graecas. Vita Luciani Samosatensis rhetoris e graeco in latinum traducta. Historia longaeavorum eiusdem Luciani etiam latine donata. Institutio li-*

²⁶ See the summary of the contents of his book (sig. ai^v), below.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, sig. aii.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, sig. bvi.

²⁹ See below, p. 403, n. 37.

³⁰ Included among them were some translations of Lucian lately received from Erasmus. These, added to the ones published in 1506, made up the 1514 edition referred to above (pp. 398-99).

³¹ Adalbert Horawitz, *Analekten zur Geschichte des Humanismus in Schwaben* (Vienna, 1877), p. 44.

³² Messrs. J. and J. Leighton's catalogue (the "bookseller's catalogue" mentioned by Garrod, above, p. 399), gives the date "[c. 1508]" for the book, upon what grounds I know not. Badius' letter eliminates the possibility of any date but 1513 or 1514.

³³ Badius said concerning the translations referred to above in n. 30: *propediem impressuri sumus*, but they did not appear until June 1, 1514.

berorum optima, nec prius impressa. [Printer's device of a press.] *Vaeundantur in officina Ascensiana.*³⁴

The contents may be summarized as follows:

Sig. ai^v: *Paraeneticum authoris carmen ad lectorem.* Two lines of this are in Greek. Followed by: *Egidius Delphus*³⁵ *Gervasio suo.S.*, two lines; this is succeeded by: *Egidio Delpho sacrae paginae professori ac praeceptori suo plurimum observando Gervasius.S.*, two lines.

Sig. aii: Dedication, headed: *Ornatissimo viro Lodoico Budeo*³⁶ *archidiacono Trecensi Mecoenati suo Gervasius Amoenus Drucensis.S.* Written *Parisiis ex collegio Narbonensi pridie kalendas Maias* (no year-date is given). Amoenus complains of sickness; his physician, he says, advised him to desist from study. He submits for Budé's approval *primores hasce odas atque orationes deo ac intemeratae virgini*. Inasmuch as these did not make a volume, he has added some other works, which, though on profane subjects, are elevating.

Sigs. aii^v-avi^v: *Hymnus iambico dimetro constans ad gloriosam Trinitatem*; title preceded by: *Τὴν τῶν πάντων ἀρχὴν καὶ τέλος ποιῶ θεὸν* [sic].

Sigs. avii-bi: *Odae* [sic] *dicolos distrophos altero versu heroico hexametro altero iambico dimetro. Ad intemeratam Virginem.*

³⁴ The volume is a quarto; sigs. a-cviii, dvi. In quotations from it most abbreviations are expanded and capitals reduced.

³⁵ Aegidius Delphus (Gilles de Delft) (d. 1524) was doctor of theology and rector of the University of Paris. Among his works were an edition of Ovid's *Remedia amoris* and translations of the seven penitential psalms and of the Epistle to the Romans into heroic verse. Erasmus alludes to him as a learned theologian and adds that he translated almost the entire body of Scripture into verse (*EE*, II, 323, 87-324, 1; cf. *Erasmii opera omnia*, ed. J. Leclerc [Leiden, 1703-6; cited hereafter as *LB*], IX, 1115 D). In *Ciceronianus* he describes him as *Virum eruditionis variae, versificatorem non malum, si facilitati nervos addidisset* (*LB*, I, 1013 F). He is named also in Erasmus' *Apologia pro declamatione matrimonii* (*ibid.*, IX, 107 D) and *Apologia adversus debacchationes Petri Sutoris* (*ibid.*, p. 753 F). See *EE*, II, 323, 87 n.; P. Feret, *La Faculté de théologie de Paris* (Paris, 1894-1910), II, 63-64; Léopold Delisle, "Notice sur un registre des procès-verbaux de la faculté de théologie de Paris," *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, XXXVI, Part I (1899), 357, 359, 360.

³⁶ Amoenus' patron, Louis Budé (1470-1517), a brother of the celebrated Guillaume Budé, was canon of Auxerre and archdeacon of Troyes. Guillaume Budé, in a letter to Erasmus, December 21, 1517, mentions his recent death (November 19, 1517) and says that he was fond of Erasmus' writings and that he knew Greek (*EE*, III, 174, 65-68 and n.). See M. H. Omont, "Notes sur la famille de Guillaume Budé," *Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris*, XII (1885), 47; Louis Delaruelle (ed.), *Répertoire ... de la correspondance de Guillaume Budé* (Toulouse and Paris, 1907), p. 12 n.

Sigs. bi-bii: *Catapultus [sic] elegiacus ad eandem pientissimam Virginem.*

Sigs. bii-biii^v: *Ad eandem Parthenicen de sanctissima eius conceptione carmen Sapphicum.*

Sigs. biii^v-bv: *Elegiae tres, quarum prima in blasphemos Christi. Secunda de mutuis inter Christianos bellis elegia. Tertia sacrae theologiae est: quae nunc sophisticis nugis passim contaminetur.*

Sigs. bv-bv^v: *Carmen heroicum quod varia hominum studia complectens summam demum huius saeculi felicitatem ostendit.*

Sigs. bvi-ciiii: *Gervasii Amoeni Drucensis oratio suasoria ad capendas litteras graecas habita in perfectionem grammatices Theodori Gazae.* This work, and the translation of Lucian's *Somnium* that comes after it, are dedicated in a brief epistle *Domino Guilielmo Merceri Narbonensis Collegii primario*.³⁷

The oration is conventional in its arguments: Greek has been neglected of late; it is indispensable to all learning, especially to divinity; it is superior to Latin; Latin translations of Greek writings are not enough—one must know the original language.

In the Preface to his translation of Book iv of Gaza's grammar (Leipzig, 1516), Richard Croke speaks of having been informed by

³⁷ According to Amoenus (sig. bvi), he was encouraged to write this oration in support of Greek studies by Jerome Aleander. Aleander, who became papal librarian (1519) and cardinal (1536), is remembered today chiefly because he was papal legate to the Diet of Worms (1521) and there opposed Luther. But he was a humanist as well and was one of the earliest teachers of Greek in the University of Paris ("Le véritable fondateur de l'enseignement du grec à Paris" [J. Paquier, *L'Humanisme et la réforme: Jérôme Aléandre* (Paris, 1900), p. 37]). He taught there in 1508-10 and 1511-13 (*ibid.*, pp. 31-45, 49-57), becoming rector of the University in 1513 (M. H. Omont [ed.], "Journal autobiographique du Cardinal Jérôme Aléandre [1480-1530]," *Notices et extraits des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque nationale*, XXXV, Part I [1896], 14). One of the works he lectured on was Gaza's Greek grammar (J. Paquier [ed.], *Lettres familières de Jérôme Aléandre [1510-1540]* [Paris, 1909], p. 22). In or about 1512 an edition of Book i of Gaza's grammar was published in Paris. This was the first edition of any part of the grammar to appear there (M. H. Omont, "Essai sur les débuts de la typographie grecque à Paris," *Mémoires de la Société de l'Histoire de Paris*, XVIII [1891], 12, 16, 32. Another edition of Book i appeared ca. 1515, and one of Books i-iv in 1516 (*ibid.*, pp. 12, 16)). No editor's name is on the title-page, but because Aleander was giving instruction in this work in Paris at the time (*Lettres familières de Jérôme Aléandre [1510-1540]*, p. 22), and because of an allusion in another work of his (preface to an edition of Chrysoloras' Greek grammar [?1516/7; 1st ed., 1512]. Omont, "Essai sur les débuts de la typographie grecque à Paris," *op. cit.*, p. 70; cf. pp. 7-11), the edition may be attributed to him. It must be this 1512 edition of Gaza's grammar that Amoenus refers to. Quite probably he had heard Aleander's lectures on the work.

I do not find the name of Amoenus in Aleander's writings.

Thomas More that Amoenus "... Erasmica prelectione adiutum iampridem eundem quartum et vertisse et edidisse."³⁸ I cannot discover any trace of a translation of Gaza by Amoenus. I suggest that, when writing to Croke, More may have had in mind the *Oratio* in Amoenus' *Lucubrationculae*—the date of which would fit "iampridem"—though perhaps he was ignorant or forgetful of its contents.

Erasmus, writing from Cambridge in October, 1511,³⁹ looks forward to lecturing on Gaza's grammar. If he delivered the lectures, Amoenus may have heard them, since he seems to have been in England at the time.⁴⁰ If this were so, the meaning of "Erasmica prelectione" would then be clear.

Erasmus afterward translated Books i (1516) and ii (1518) of Gaza's grammar.

Sig. ciiii: *Compendiaria vita Luciani Samosatensis rhetoris quum a Suida tum aliis authorum monumentis excepta*. In this very brief account, which is mostly a paraphrase of the one in the *Lexicon* of Suidas, Amoenus makes the surprising statement—for which there is, of course, no authority in Suidas—that Lucian was at first a Christian but later deserted the faith. A misunderstanding of Suidas or a careless reading of Lucian's *Peregrinus* may have suggested this fancy to him.

Sigs. ciili-cvii: *Insomnium seu vita Luciani Samosatensis rhetoris e graeco in latinum traducta Gervasio Amoeno Drucensi interprete*. Inasmuch as Amoenus is known to have published one of Erasmus' translations of Lucian without permission, it is only natural to ask whether he might not have obtained and so published another one also; whether, that is, this version of *Somnium* might not have been made in fact by Erasmus. But we can be reasonably sure that it was not, else would Erasmus have named it, as he named *Longaevi*, in his letter to Botzheim.⁴¹

Sigs. cvii^v-dii^v: *Longaevi Luciani*. For the text, see below, pages 410-5. The translation is followed (sigs. dii^v-diii) by:

³⁸ Quoted by Allen, *EE*, I, 442 n. Croke was a pupil of Aleander in Paris, 1511-12 (*ibid.*, I, 503, 25).

³⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 473, 8-9.

⁴⁰ See above, pp. 400-401.

⁴¹ *EE*, I, 7, 25-8, 10.

Domino Monloio⁴² [sic] Gervasius.S.D.⁴³

Etsi nonnulla vident dissuadere ut hanc orationem meis lucubrationibus inseram, unice litteratorum Mecoenas, non putavi tamen committendum ut tanto fructu studiosi adolescentes frustrarentur. Nam quod laborum meorum non sit (quod ego ingenue fateor ut tute nosti) non adeo me movit quo minus impressioni darem. Siquidem in hac parte visum est praestantius (quod Plynius ait) vel fastidio calumniam subire, nimiaque diligentia insimulari quam communis studiosorum utilitatis non rationem habere. Hoc itaque doctum & utile opus quod olim in tuo museo inter chartulas offendi, sive a domino Erasmo (neque enim mihi satis constat) sive ab alio quopiam, perfectum publicandum curavi, hac lege ut eo interea studiosi fruantur, & illius auctor tanquam suum ubi lubebit asserere queat. Bene vale.

If what Amoenus says in this statement is true, Erasmus' assertion that Amoenus published the translation "*pro suo*"⁴⁴ is only partially correct. The title-page of the *Lucubrationum* does not hint that the translation is not the work of Amoenus, but in the second sentence of the statement quoted above Amoenus plainly declares that it is not his. In the fourth sentence he professes ignorance of its authorship, though he suggests that it might be from the pen of his former master, Erasmus. Whether Amoenus is being candid here, or whether (as I am inclined to think) he has not forgotten that Erasmus had dictated the translation to him but prefers to ignore the fact, is difficult to decide. He is prudent enough to disclaim authorship, but it may be doubted whether he tells all he knows about the matter.

If we accept Amoenus' assurance that the translation was discovered among Mountjoy's papers (*in tuo museo inter chartulas*), its presence there can be explained by the fact that it was Erasmus' custom to send his early translations of Lucian to his friends as gifts.⁴⁵ Amoenus must have copied or taken it, with or without permission, and kept it until he had opportunity to publish it. The fact that he found it *in tuo museo inter chartulas* may be taken as additional evidence that he had been in England.

Sigs. diiii-div^v: *Erasmus Christiano suo.S.D.* Advice to a student.

⁴² William Blount, Lord Mountjoy (ca. 1479-1534), Erasmus' pupil, patron, and friend (see *ibid.*, I, 207 *et passim*).

⁴³ I have added a few punctuation marks to this letter where necessary.

⁴⁴ See above, p. 399.

⁴⁵ *EE*, I, 8, 6-8.

Allen⁴⁶ states that Erasmus' letter,⁴⁷ which was written from Paris (?1497), was first printed in the first edition of his *Colloquia* (Basel: Froben, November, 1518) as *Erasmi . . . de ratione studii ad amicum quendam epistola protreptica*, and that the name of the addressee (Christian Northoff) was perhaps not added until the letter was printed in *Farrago nova epistolarum Des. Erasmi Roterodami . . .* (Basel: Froben, October, 1519). We can now correct this information and say that the letter, and the first name of the person to whom it was addressed, were first printed in Amoenus' *Lucubrationculae*, 1513 or 1514.

The appearance of this letter in Amoenus' *Lucubrationculae* can be explained in several ways. Since it was afterward printed in Erasmus' *De conscribendis epistolis*,⁴⁸ we may presume that it was in the *De conscribendis epistolis* when that treatise was still in manuscript. Mountjoy had an early manuscript copy of *De conscribendis epistolis*.⁴⁹ Either Amoenus saw this, some years later, among Mountjoy's papers, and took or copied this letter from it (just as he saw and took or copied the translation of *Longaevi*), or he copied it from Erasmus' own papers—whether from his correspondence, from *De conscribendis epistolis*, or possibly from the early *Colloquia*—when he was in Erasmus' service. According to Erasmus, a manuscript of the *De conscribendis epistolis* was copied for him by a secretary ca. 1506.⁵⁰ If the secretary was Amoenus, as he may well have been, the appearance of the letter in the *Lucubrationculae* is easily accounted for.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 171; cf. *Bibliotheca Erasmiana (Extrait de la Bibliotheca Belgica)* (Ghent, 1897—), *Colloquia*, I, 9–12^{bis}.

⁴⁷ In several places the text offered by Amoenus has readings that are neither in Allen's text (*EE*, I, 172–73) nor among the variants he records. These readings are as follows (numbers refer to lines in *EE*, I, 172–73; "A" = text in Amoenus' *Lucubrationculae*): 7 *accipies*, A *accipias*; 16–17 *litterarum praeceptorem sis*, A *litterarum sis praeceptorem*; 32 *Brachilogum*, A *Brachiloquum*; 34 *initio non*, A *Initio vero non*; 63 *reposcas*, A *reposes*; 64 *impertias*, A *impartias*; 65 *semel avolarit, redit*, A *avolaverit semel, redit*.

The name "Christian" appears only in the salutation of the letter in Amoenus' text. In the body of the letter, "N" is used.

⁴⁸ Cf. *LB*, I, 446 F–447 F.

⁴⁹ See below, p. 407.

⁵⁰ *LB*, IX, 813 B; cf. *EE*, V, 63. In the Preface to the first edition of *De conscribendis epistolis*, Siberch, the printer, "states . . . that the book was printed from a copy made by a friend some years before from Erasmus' own manuscript" (Allen, *EE*, I, 198). Could the friend have been Amoenus?

Sigs. div^v-dvi: Two brief compositions concerning education and manners. The first one (sigs. div^v-dv^v) is: *Praeceptiuncula, quis sit modus lectionis repetendae* (the second paragraph has a separate title, *Utrum secreta studia plus conducant quam confictatio illa, an contra*); the second (sigs. dv^v-dvi), *Compendiaria quaedam vitae institutio composita ab Erasmo nec unquam hactenus impressa*. The *Praeceptiuncula, quis sit modus lectionis repetendae* was afterward printed in Froben's February, 1519, edition of the *Colloquia*, then in *De conscribendis epistolis*, where it appears as the first section of Cap. liv.⁵¹ The *Compendiaria quaedam vitae institutio* was also printed in *De conscribendis epistolis*; it is a part of the *Exemplum epistolae monitoriae* in Cap. liii.⁵²

An unauthorized edition of *De conscribendis epistolis* was published in 1521 (Cambridge: Siberch);⁵³ the first authorized edition in August of the following year, 1522 (Basel: Froben). But Erasmus had been working on the treatise as early as 1498, or earlier.⁵⁴ He was again engaged upon it in Cambridge in 1511.⁵⁵ An early copy was sent to Mountjoy.⁵⁶ Amoenus must have obtained the *Praeceptiuncula, quis*

⁵¹ *LB*, I, 447 F—448 E. The text in the *Lucubrationunculae* contains some readings different from those in *LB* (numbers refer to lines in *LB*, letters in parentheses to column-divisions in *LB*; "A" before a reading designates Amoenus' *Lucubrationunculae*): 8-9 (A) *verbum obscurum*, A *verbum sit obscurae*; 9-10 (A) *heteroclitae coniugationis*, A *etheroclitae* [sic] *declinationis*; 12 (A) *huiusmodi*, A *eiusmodi*; 17 (B) *inspicias*, A *incipies*; 18 (B) *scrutabere*, Auctoris, A *sciscitabere*: *Authorum*; 19 (B) *quidque*, A *quicquid*; 19 (B) *dixerit*, A *dizerint*; 23 (B) *Invenies*, A *Iuvenies* [sic]; 25 (B) *quapiam*, A *quadam*; 26 (B) *qua*, A *quae*; 27-28 (B-C) *qua similitudo*, A *quae similitudo*; 31 (C) &, A *id est*; 36 (C) *saepenumero*, A *saepe mihi*; 42 (D) *ex*, A *de*; 44 (D) *pulchre*, A *pulchrae*; 56 (E) *id*, A *Ad*; 58 (E) *nimirum*, A *inanem*; 60 (E) *vale*, omitted by A.

⁵² *LB*, I, 446 D-F. Different readings: 41 (D) *quod semper fecisti*, omitted by A; 42 (D) *obtime*, A *indue*; 44 (D) *deflectatur*, A *deflectat*; 44 (D) *tibi*, omitted by A; 45 (D) *iactes*, A *iactiles*; 46 (D) *quum*, A *cur*; 46 (D) *anteferendus*, A *anteponendus*; 50 (D) *praebeas*: *domi hilaris*, A *praebeas & comem*. *Domi hilaris*; 56-58 (E) *Ne capta laudari, sed fac laudanda. Cum praepotentibus, aut nulla sit consuetudo, aut comis*, omitted by A; 58 (E) *Nullus sumptus tibi sit preciosior tempore*, A *Nihil sit tibi tempore sumptuosius*; 63 (E) *ne ignavia*, A *ne vel ignavia*; 67 (F) *vale*, omitted by A.

Possibly the variant readings have some connection with another composition by Erasmus on letter-writing, the *Brevissima maximeque compendiaria conficiendarum epistolarum formula*, which I have not seen. There is no record of a printing of this work before 1520, but it may have circulated in manuscript before that date (see *EE*, IV, 456, 5 n.).

⁵³ *EE*, I, 198; I, 9, 13-18.

⁵⁴ *EE*, I, 485, 28-29.

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 198; cf. *LB*, I, 343.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 198; I, 271.

sit modus lectionis repetendae and the *Compendiaria quaedam vitae institutio* by the same means as those by which he obtained the *Epistola protreptica* printed at sigs. diii-div^v.

So far as I can learn, these two compositions, like the *Epistola protreptica*, appeared in print for the first time in Amoenus' *Lucubratiunculae*.

The foregoing description of the contents of Gervasius Amoenus' *Lucubratiunculae* is sufficient, I believe, to give the reader an idea of the nature of the book. Its compositions of Christian devotion side by side with its classical exercises reflect, as do so many other volumes of the Renaissance, notably those of Erasmus, the conjunction of piety and classical letters common in the age. Amoenus' *Oratio suasoria ad capessendas litteras graecas* and his translation of Lucian's *Somnium* are interesting, though not important. The translation of Lucian's *Longaevi* by Erasmus, now recovered after having been lost for more than four centuries, is not, in itself, of much importance either; but considered as a sample of the discipline by which Erasmus attained to familiarity with the ancient languages and literatures, it does have some significance. It is not representative of the Lucianic writings translated by Erasmus, for it is not ironical, as most of them are. Yet it is another of the numerous witnesses to Erasmus' fondness for Lucian. Furthermore, the recent discovery of this version, which was originally printed under such odd circumstances, completes the existing collections of Erasmus' translations of Lucian. We now have, for the first time, all of those translations.

II

The *Longaevi* is no longer considered genuine,⁵⁷ but there is no reason to suppose that Erasmus doubted its authenticity, or that he would have been affected by the question if he had been aware of it.

The date of the translation can be fixed with confidence as 1505-6, the year in which Erasmus made most of his translations of Lucian, for we know that Amoenus was in his service in 1506. In the catalogue

⁵⁷ Cf. M. Croiset, *Essai sur la vie et les œuvres de Lucien* (Paris, 1882), p. 43. A. M. Harmon (*Lucian*, I, 221 ["Loeb Classical Library"]) says it "cannot fairly be fathered on Lucian." Cf. W. Kunzmann, *Quaestiones de pseudo-Luciani libelli qui est De longaevi fontibus atque auctoritate* (Leipzig, 1908).

of his writings in his letter to Botzheim,⁵⁸ Erasmus includes *Longaevi* with the other translations of Lucian.

When the translation of *Longaevi* was made, two editions of Lucian's works in Greek existed. One was the *editio princeps*, 1496 (Florence: Laurentius de Alopa); the other, Aldus' of 1503. The internal evidence for deciding which text Erasmus used in translating *Longaevi* is very meager. There is only one instance of a significant difference between the texts of 1496 and 1503 from which to draw conclusions about the source. In that instance,⁵⁹ Erasmus and the text of 1503 agree against the text of 1496. Because of this fact, and because it is inherently probable that Aldus' book had a wider circulation than Laurentius de Alopa's did, and was therefore more likely to be known to Erasmus, it seems to me probable that Erasmus translated from the text of 1503.⁶⁰

The 1503 text, as my quotations in the notes to Erasmus' translation show, is not infrequently corrupt in accents and spellings. Breathings are sometimes omitted. Editorial mistakes in the Greek text are preserved in the version by Erasmus: when the punctuation of the Greek causes distortions of meaning, the same distortions are found in the Latin.⁶¹ Occasionally the translator has misunderstood or misread the Greek,⁶² has left words untranslated,⁶³ or has added explanatory words.⁶⁴ Many of the proper names in the Greek text are misspelled in the translation. The number of such misspellings,⁶⁵ and the

⁵⁸ *EE*, I, 8, 8-10.

⁵⁹ See below, p. 412, n. 9.

⁶⁰ At the time of his death Erasmus possessed an Aldine Lucian in Greek (Fritz Husner, "Die Bibliothek des Erasmus," *Gedenkschrift zum 400. Todestage des Erasmus von Rotterdam* [Basel, 1936], p. 239, No. 123). We cannot be positive that this was the 1503 Lucian, however, for another Aldine Lucian in Greek appeared in 1522. And even if it was, that fact would not exclude the possibility that Erasmus used another (i.e., the 1496) text in making his translation. On the 1503 Lucian cf. C. R. Thompson, "The Date of the First Aldine Lucian," *Classical Journal*, XXXV (1940), 233-35.

⁶¹ See p. 412, n. 9; p. 413, n. 19.

⁶² See p. 411, n. 4; p. 412, n. 11; p. 413, n. 21; p. 415, n. 30.

⁶³ See p. 410, n. 3; p. 412, nn. 7 and 12; p. 413, n. 22; p. 414, n. 26; p. 415, nn. 29, 30, and 33.

⁶⁴ See p. 410, n. 2; p. 413, n. 17; p. 415, nn. 30 and 32.

⁶⁵ See p. 411, n. 5; p. 412, nn. 8, 10, 13, and 14; p. 413, nn. 15, 16, and 20; p. 414, nn. 25, 27, and 28; p. 415, n. 31.

unreasonableness of a few of them (e.g., *Moremon* for *Μῆμον*, *Casbius* for *Λέσβιος*), support the credibility of Erasmus' assertion that this translation was dictated to his servant-pupil, who might easily have misunderstood the unfamiliar words he was taking down.

I can find no record of a printed translation of Lucian's *Longaevi* prior to this one by Erasmus in Amoenus' *Lucubratiunculae*.

LONGAEVI LUCIANI¹

Adfero tibi muneris loco longaevos, ornatissime Quintille, somnio quodam ut id facerem admonitus; quod olim quidem vidi, visumque amicis exposui quum alteri filio tuo nomen imponeres. Caeterum cum coniectare non possem quosnam longaevos deus me tibi iuberet offerre, optabam a diis ut tum tibi tum liberis tuis vitam quam longissimam darent: ratus id expedire quum universo mortalium generi, tum praecipue mihi meisque omnibus. Videbatur enim deus mihi quoque quiddam boni portendere. Deinde quum rem mecum expenderem, venit in mentem vero proximum esse id iubere deos ut viro litterarum studioso litterarum aliquid mitterem. Itaque quum putem hunc diem tuorum natalium esse longe auspiciatissimum, dono tibi eos qui prospera corporis valitudine [*sic*], menteque integra ad multam senectutem pertigisse narrantur. Maxime quum geminam quandam ex hoc libro sis utilitatem percepturus. Nam primum animi voluptatem nonnullam adferet spemque bonam praebebit, ut te quoque quam longissime vivere posse confidas. Deinde exemplis non nihil eruditionis accedet, si cognosces qui maxime corporis & animi curam egerunt, eos incolumi prorsus valetudine ad plurimam senectam pervenisse. Nestorem igitur graecorum sapientissimum ad tres usque aetates pertigisse narrat Homerus: quem nobis velut exemplar proponit hominis optime & animo & corpore exercitati. Porro Tiresiam vatem ad sextam aetatem venisse prodidit tragoedia. Est autem verisimile virum diis dicatum, puraque vitae ratione utentem Tiresiam,² quam diutissime vixisse. Quin & hominum genera quaedam tota longioris aevi referuntur esse ob vitae moderationem, quemadmodum qui apud aegyptum hierogrammates, id est sacri scribae, vocantur. Et apud Arabos³ fabularum interpretes. Apud indos autem ii qui Bragmanes appellantur, homines mire dediti philosophiae studiis. Praeterea qui vocantur magi, genus divinum, diisque sacrum. Tum & apud Persas, Parthos, Bactros, Chorasimios, Areos, Sacas ac Medos atque apud alios barbaros complures, sunt & valentes & longaevi propterea quod & ipsi

¹ The punctuation of the text is revised where revision is needed. When the 1496 and 1503 texts are quoted in the notes, the forms of letters are normalized, but misplaced accents are left uncorrected; and breathings, when wanting, are not supplied. Unless the reading of 1496 differs significantly from that of 1503, only the reading of 1503 is given.

² The name is not repeated in the Greek.

³ Ασσυρίων δέ, καὶ Αράβων 1503.

philosophiae studio temperatissime vivant. Iam vero etiam nationes nonnullae longissimae vitae reperiuntur, velut Seres quos litteris proditum est ad trecentos annos vivere; aliis caelo, aliis terrae longioris aevi causam ascribentibus, aliis etiam vitae moderationi. Aiunt enim totam hanc gentem aquae potu uti. Item Athotas triginta supra centum annos vivere est in historiis. Praeterea Chaldaeos centesimum annum praetergredi fama est: atque eosdem pane hordeaceo vesci, tanquam id aciendo visui conducat. Et ob hanc victus temperiem aiunt caeteris quoque sensibus praeter alios mortales valere. Et hactenus quidem de longaeuitate generum ac nationum quas narrant vivacissimas esse sive propter terrae coelique naturam, sive propter vitae rationem vel propter utrunque. Ego vero tibi quoque longae vitae spem merito facileque iniecerim, si exposuero quibuslibet in terris & sub quovis coelo longaeos homines extitisse qui moderatis exercitationibus & vitae ratione quam maxime ad bonam valetudinem idonea sint usi. Sic autem partiar sermonem ut prima parte virorum studia sequar: primoque tibi regum ac ducum exempla percensebo. Quorum de numero est is quem augustissima magni divinissimique imperatoris fortuna ad summum evexit locum, eaque re de orbe terrarum cuius est ipse dominus, optime meritis. Sic enim fiet ut tu quoque ad imitandum vivacium hominum habitudinem, ac fortunae benignitatem respiciens, senectutem speres & sanam & longam. Simulque vitae moderationem aemulatus, vitam tibi reddas & longissimam & saluberrimam. Numa Pompilius, regum Romanorum felicissimus, maxime religioni deorum deditus, ultra octogesimum annum vixisse traditur. Servius tullius, rex & ipse Romanorum, octogesimum item annum excessisse narratur. Tarquinius, postremus romanorum rex, in exilium actus & Cumis agens, prosperrima valetudine nonagesimum annum praetergressus legitur. Atque hi quidem reges Romani, quibus annectam & caeteros reges qui ad multam senectutem pervenerunt. Deinde uniuscuiusque subiiciam exercitationes. Postremo & reliquos ascribam Romanos qui ad longissimam senectutem pervenerunt, additis & iis qui per omnem reliquam Italiam quam diutissime vixerint. Revincet enim probabilibus argumentis historia eos qui caelum hoc calumniari conantur, ut sperare possitis vestra vota⁴ futura rata quibus optatis ut universae terrae marisque dominus ad longissimam vegetamque senectam perveniat. Agathonium [sic],⁵ Tartesiorum regem, quinquaginta supra centum annos vixisse narrant Herodotus historicus & Anacreon lyricus. Quamquam hoc fabulosum esse nonnullis videtur. Agathocles, Siciliae tyrannus, annos natus nonaginta quinque mortuus est, quemadmodum Demochares & Timaeus referunt. Hieron, Syracusanus tyrannus, annos natus nonagintaduos morbo periit, cum regnasset annos septuaginta, ut auctores sunt Demetrius & Calistianus.⁶ Anteas, scytharum rex, adversus Philippum ad

⁴ ἡμῖν τὰς εὐχὰς 1503.

⁵ Ἀργανθῶνιος 1503.

⁶ Δημήτριος τε ὁ καλλιστιανὸς 1503. Later editors emend καλλιστιανὸς to Καλλατιανὸς (= "Demetrius of Callatia").

flumen istri pugnans cecidit, annos natus plusquam nonaginta. Bardilis, Illyriorum rex, narratur ex equo pugnasse in eo proelio quod cum Philippo commisit nonaginta praetergressus annos. Teres, Drusorum rex, auctore Theopompo nonagenarius⁷ diem obiit. Antigonus Philippi filius unoculus, Macedonum rex, in phrygia contra Selerium [*sic*]⁸ ac Lysimachum pugnans, multis vulneribus confectus periit annos natus unum & octoginta, veluti refert Hieronymus qui sub illo militavit. Item Lysimachus, macedonum rex, in pugna adversus Seleucon periit annum agens octogesimum, ut idem narrat Hieronymus. Antigonus autem, filius Demetrii, nepos Antigoni Lusci, quadragintaquattuor annis regnavit; vixit octoginta quemadmodum Medius alique historici litteris prodiderunt. Consimiliter & Antipater, Iolai filius, qui plurimum valuit multosque macedonum reges subvertit: peractis plus octoginta annis diem obiit. Ptolemaeus, Lagi filius, regum eius aetatis omnium fortunatissimus, aegyptiis imperavit octogintaquattuor annos,⁹ vivusque tradidit ipsius Ptolemaeo filio, cui cognomen Philadelpho, biennio ante mortem, qui solus ex fratribus in paternum regnum successit. Philaeteos [*sic*]¹⁰ primus Pergami regnavit cum esset eunuchus; obiit diem annos natus octoginta. Attalus, cognomento Philadelphus & hic Pergamenorum rex, ad quem & Scipio, ductor Romanus, pervenit, octogesimosecundo anno vitam finiit. Mithridates, rex ponti cognomento Ctistes, cum Antigonum unoculum fugeret in ponto diem extremum obiit, annos natus octogintaquattuor, ut Hieronymus caeterique scriptores memorant. Ariarathes, Cappadocum rex, duos & octoginta vixit annos, ut inquit Hieronymus; fortassis victurus etiam diutius verum in pugna adversus Perdicam captus in crucem suffixus est. Cyrus, persarum rex ille priscus, quemadmodum indicant Assyriorum litterae, cum quibus senti[r]e videtur Onesicritus qui scripsit ferme Alexandri temporibus,¹¹ natus annos centum quum singulos amicos requisisset cognovissetque plerosque sublato a Cambyse filio, isque diceret sese hoc ipsius iussu fecisse, partim male audiens ob filii crudelitatem, partim se ipsum ut desipiscentem incusans, vite [*sic*] diem obiit.¹² Ataxerses [*sic*],¹³ cognomine Moremon [*sic*],¹⁴ adversus quem Cyrus frater exercitum duxit, in persis regnans periit morbo sex & octoginta natus annos, aut ut refert Dinon non-

⁷ δύο, καὶ ἐνέηκοντα ἐτῶν 1503.

⁸ Σελεύκῳ 1503.

⁹ In Amoenus' text the comma after *annos* should be withdrawn and placed instead after *imperavit*, but I allow it to stand because it suggests that the translator was not guided by the punctuation of the text of 1496 but rather by that of the text of 1503; in other words, that he was translating from the text of 1503. αἰγύπτου μὲν ἐβασίλευσε Τίσσαρα καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα βιώσας ἔτη 1496. Αἰγύπτου μὲν ἐβασίλευσε τίσσαρα, καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα βιώσας ἔτη 1503.

¹⁰ Φιλάτερος 1503.

¹¹ ὁ τὰ περὶ Αλεξάνδρου συγγράψας 1503.

¹² ἀθυμήσας 1503 is untranslated.

¹³ Ἀρταξέρξης 1503.

¹⁴ Μνήμων 1503.

agintaquattuor. Ataxerses [sic],¹⁵ alter Persarum rex, quem Isidorus Charaunus [sic]¹⁶ scripsit maiorum suorum temporibus regnasse, annos natus nonagintatres fratris Gosithri insidiis sublatus est. Synarthocles, Parthiensium rex, annum egressus¹⁷ octogesimum a Sacauracibus Scythis adactus regnare coepit ac regnavit annos septem. Tigranes, Armeniorum rex, adversus quem Lucullus bellum gessit, quinque & octoginta natus annos supremum vitae diem obiit morbo absumptus. Hispasiens, Characis filius,¹⁸ rex eorum qui iuxta Erythram accolunt, octogintaquinque natus annos morbo vitam finiit. Tereus, qui post Hispasiensem tertius regnavit, nonagesimo-seculo vitae anno morbo interiit. Artabazus is qui septimus post Tereum imperavit Characi sex & octoginta annorum, ascitus a Parthis imperium tenuit.¹⁹ Mnasiens, rex Parthiensium, sex supra nonaginta vixit annos. Massinissas, Maurusiorum princeps, nonaginta vixit annos. Asander autem, qui pro praeside vocatus est rex Bosphoria divo Augusto, cum esset ferme nonagenarius nemini cedebat vel equestri pugna vel pedestri. Is cum vidisset milites in pugna ad Scribonium desciscere spontanea inedia periit annos natus nonaginta tres. Soaesus [sic],²⁰ uti refert Isidorus Characenus, suis temporibus Manon dictus aromatarii filius, cum annos regnasset quindecim, vixissetque centum, morbo interiit.²¹ Atque hos quidem reges longaevos maiores nostri prodiderunt. Iam & de philosophis caeterisque litterarum studiosis, qui valitudinis [sic] curam agentes ad longam senectutem pervenerunt, commemoremus quorum apud scriptores fit mentio, & primo quidem loco de philosophis. Democritus igitur Abderita annos natus centum & quattuor cibo abstinens vitam finiit. Xenophilus musicus, ut auctor est Aristoxenus, Pythagoricae addictus philosophiae vixit Athenis ultra centum annos & quinque. Solon, Thales, & Pittacus, qui de numero septem sapientum fuerunt, vixerunt singuli centum annos. Zenon, stoicae scholae princeps, annos vixit nonaginta;²² de quo referunt quum in concionem ingressus prolapsus esset dixisse, "Quid me vocas?" deinde domum regressus ac cibis abstinens vitam finiit. Cleanthes, Zenonis discipulus ac successor, nonaginta novem natus

¹⁵ Ἀρταξέρξης 1503.

¹⁶ Χαρακηνός 1503.

¹⁷ There is no word for *egressus* in 1503.

¹⁸ Τσπασίνης δὲ ὁ Χάρακος 1503.

¹⁹ As punctuated in the *Lucubratiunculae*, the Latin does not convey the meaning of the original. I retain the mispunctuation in order to demonstrate the translator's failure to understand the Greek at this point. Ἀρτάβαζος δὲ ὁ μετὰ Τείραιον ἑβδόμος βασιλεύσας Χάρακος, ξί, καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα ἐτῶν καταχθελὶς ἀπὸ Πάρθων, ἐβασίλευσε 1503. The only punctuation in the text of 1496 is a colon after Χάρακος.

²⁰ Γόαισος 1503.

²¹ ἐπὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ ἡλικίας ὁ Μαῶν τῆς ἀρωματοφόρου βασιλεύσας, πεντεκαίδεκα, καὶ ἑκατὸν γεγονὼς ἐτῶν, ἐτελεύτησε νόσῳ 1503. No punctuation in 1496.

²² ὀκτὼ, καὶ εἵνεκοντα 1503.

annos bubonem²³ habebat in labro atque obduruit.²⁴ Deinde quum ad eum allatae essent epistolae quaedam ab amicis, rursum accepto cibo peractisque iis quae postulabant amici, denuo cibo abstinens vitam reliquit. Xenophanes, Dexini filius, Archelai physici discipulus, vixit annos nonagintaunum. Xenocrates, Platonis discipulus, obiit natus annos octogintaquattuor. Carneades, posterioris Academiae princeps, annos vixit octoginta quinque. Chrisippus octoginta unum. Diogenes Seleucensis Trigoriundus [*sic*],²⁵ stoicus philosophus, octoginta octo. Posidonius Apameus, ea est Syriae civitas, lege Rhodius, idemque philosophus & historiae scriptor, octogintaquattuor. Critolaus peripateticus supra octoginta duos. Plato ille divinus, octogintaunum. Athenodorus Sandonius Tarsensis, stoicus qui & praeceptor fuit Caesaris divi Augusti, a quo Tarsensium civitas a tributis immunis est reddita, cum annos vixisset octogintaduos in patria mortem obiit, eique Tarsensium populus quotannis honores persolvit ut divo. Nestor, stoicus Tarsensis, praeceptor caesaris Tiberii, annos vixit nonagintaduos. Xenophon, Grilli filius, ultra annos nonaginta vixit. Atque ii quidem inter philosophos celebres. Porro ex scriptoribus Ctesibius centum & vigintiquattuor natus annos in ambulatione periit, quemadmodum in Annalibus narrat Apollodorus. Hieronymus, in bellis versans ac plurimis exhaustis laboribus,²⁶ vixit annos quattuor supra centum, veluti narrat Agatharchides in nono Asiaticae historiae libro: virumque admiratur qui ad extremum usque vitae diem in coitu valuerit, nec ullo corporis organo factus debiliior. Hellanicus Casbius [*sic*]²⁷ octogintaquinque. Pherecides Syrus totidem peregit annos. Timeus Tauromenita nonagintasex. Aristobulus Casadrensis [*sic*]²⁸ ultra annos nonaginta vixisse legitur. Caeterum annum agens octogesimumquartum historiam conscribere aggressus est, quemadmodum ipse operis initio testatur. Polybius, Lycortae filius, Megalopolitanus, rure rediens ex equo decedit atque inde contracto morbo periit annos natus octogintaduos. Hypsicles Amisenos, histori[ae] scriptor, vir multarum disciplinarum peritus, annos vixit nonagintaduos. Ex rhetoribus Gorgias, quem nonnulli sophistam vocant, centum & octo natus annos cibo abstinens periit. Ab hoc quum quaereretur cur ad tantam senectutem pervenisset cum tanta sensuum omnium integritate, respondisse ferunt quod nunquam sese aliorum conviviiis miscuisset. Isocrates nonagintasex natus annos panegyricam orationem scripsit; anno vero undecentesimo ut cognovit Athenienses in proelio iuxta Cheroneam commisso superatos a Philippo, deos obtestatus, Euripideum versiculum subiecit eum ad sese referens, "Sidoniam

²³ Cf. C. D. du Cange, *Glossarium ad scriptores mediae et infimae Latinitatis* (Paris. 1733-36), I, 1326.

²⁴ ἀποκατερώων 1503.

²⁵ Τίγριος 1503.

²⁶ καὶ πολλοὺς καμάτους ὑπομείνας, καὶ τραύματα 1503.

²⁷ Λέσβιος 1503.

²⁸ κασανδρεὺς 1503.

olim Cadmus urbem deserens," addensque futurum ut graecia servitet [sic], vita defunctus est. Apollodorus Pergamenius rhetor, qui fuit divi caesaris Augusti praeceptor²⁹ una cum Athenodoro Philosopho Tarsensi illum erudiit, annos vixit octogintaduos. Potamon, orator haud obscurus, annos nonaginta. Sophocles, tragoediarum scriptor, acino uvae in potu hausto suffocatus est annos natus nonaginta quinque. Hic ab Iophonte filio in extrema aetate accusatus dementiae, iudicibus tragoediam cui titulus Oedipus in Colono legit, ipsa fabula demonstrans se sanae mentis esse, adeo ut iudices supramodum admirati, filium ipsum dementiae condemnaverint. Cratinus, comoediarum scriptor, septem & nonaginta vixit annis. Is quum in fine vitae pugilarem artem didicisset,³⁰ vicissetque, paulopost diem obiit. Philemon comicus eodem modo quo Cratinus septem & nonaginta peractis annis decumberebat in lecto quietus: quumque vidisset asinum ficos sibi paratas edentem, in risum concitatus est, vocatoque ministro multo ac perpetuo risu iuberet ut asino merum porrigeret, risu praefocatus interiit. Epicharmus comicus & ipse annos nonaginta septem vixisse legitur. Anacreon, lyricus poeta, vixit annos quinque & octoginta. Stesichorus lyricus totidem. Simonides cous ultra nonaginta. Ex grammaticis vero Agathosthenes [sic]³¹ Cyreneus, Aglai filius, quem non grammaticum modo verum etiam poetam recte quis dixerit ac philosophum, neque non geometram, octoginta duos vixit annos. Lycurgus, legum lator apud Lacedaemonios, octoginta quinque annos vixisse legitur. Hi sunt principes ac docti quos in praesentia³² potuimus colligere. Sed quoniam polliciti sumus nos recensuros etiam longaevos aliquot ex his qui romani [sic] atque italiam incoluissent, hoc tibi faventibus diis³³ in altero libello exponemus.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

²⁹ καὶ 1503 untranslated.

³⁰ διδάξας τὴν πυγμὴν 1503, i.e., produced his comedy, *The Flask*.

³¹ Ερατοσθένης 1503.

³² There are no words for *in praesentia* in 1503.

³³ ἐρωτᾷτε Κύντιλλε 1503 untranslated.

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

ENGINEERING SUPERSTITIONS COMPARABLE TO THAT RECORDED BY HERODOTUS I. 174

During the Golden Age man was content to remain upon the land. The waters were sacred, being in the realm of the gods.¹ The first barks that ventured to intrude upon them were challenges to the almighty powers, and they violated both natural and divine law.² Man is a terrestrial creature, as Columella says,³ and it became axiomatic in Greco-Roman antiquity that the gods created man to live upon the land.⁴

But even if man did abide within the limits divinely appointed for him, he might still interfere with the natural order of the world. We find Pliny the Elder (*Nat. Hist.* ii. 157) lamenting that the earth was continually being tortured (*cruciat*) by water, fire, wood, stone, and iron and with the bearing of crops that it might minister to man's love of luxury instead of to his needs. Pliny also thought that man was thwarting nature by quarrying into mountains for a thousand kinds of marble (xxxvi. 2) and by probing far beneath the "skin" of the earth to extract gold and other forms of wealth (ii. 158-59). It is especially pertinent to note here that he protested against the digging of channels (ii. 157) and the admitting of the sea into promontories (xxxvi. 2). Another moralist, Seneca (*Ep. Mor.* lxxxix. 21), denounces man for not being content with the land as he finds it and for driving the sea into his estates (evidently by means of ditches or small channels).

In Italy it was moralists who opposed gashing and cleaving the land, but the gods manifested their disapproval of similar acts in other countries. A striking example is to be found in Herodotus i. 174. While Harpagus, one of the generals of Cyrus the Great, was laying waste Ionia, the Cnicians, who lived on the peninsula that extended out from Caria into the Aegean Sea, decided to make an island of their country by digging across the neck of land behind them. When a large force of workmen was engaged in the operation, they began to suffer wounds, especially about the eyes, from the splintering of rocks. A mission which was sent to the oracle at Delphi to ask the reason for this mysterious occurrence brought back a terrible reply: "Fortify not the isthmus, nor dig, for Zeus would have made an island had he willed." On learning this, the Cnicians ceased work at once and yielded to Harpagus without a struggle.

¹ Hesiod *Works and Days* 236-37; Aratus *Phaen.* 110-11.

² Horace *Carm.* i. 3. 21-24; Ovid *Met.* i. 22; Sen. *Medea* 335-36. ³ i, Praefatio 8.

⁴ Many interesting references to material like that in this paragraph have been collected by K. F. Smith, *The Elegies of Albius Tibullus* (New York, 1913), pp. 246-47.

In somewhat similar fashion the earliest modern efforts to dig a canal at Corinth met with supernatural opposition. "Every time an attempt was made to cut through the isthmus, it was superstitiously abandoned. There was a legend that the earth spouted blood whenever an attempt was made to link the Gulf of Corinth with the Gulf of Aegina."⁵

Late in the sixteenth century a proposal to build a canal across the Isthmus of Panama encountered religious hostility.

The Jesuit father, Joseph de Acosta, who crossed the Isthmus in 1570, on his way to Peru, declares that he held as vain all pretensions to open the land, and that "no human power will suffice to demolish the most strong and impenetrable mountains and solid rocks, which God has placed between the two seas, and which sustain the fury of both oceans. And when it will be to men possible, it would, in my opinion, be very proper to fear the chastisement of Heaven for wishing to correct the works which the Creator, with greatest deliberation and foresight, ordained in the fabrication of this Universe."⁶

Fear of divine displeasure played a part in influencing Spain to abandon the project of a canal. With rare good humor a modern historian⁷ comments as follows upon the Jesuit father's conclusion: "Who dares to affirm that Acosta was wrong in his declaration? The divine injunction not to put asunder what God hath joined together, may apply to continents as well as to human wedlock."

In the history of the western part of our own country we find religious tenets which are strikingly similar to the views which Pliny the Elder formed on moral considerations. The Dreamers, an Indian sect that originated about the middle of the last century, were strongly opposed to tillage, and they frustrated the efforts of Brigadier-General O. O. Howard to persuade the Nez Percés to give up their nomadic ways and to live on a reservation. They held that the earth, having been created complete by God, should not be disturbed by hoe or plow and that man should subsist on things which grew of themselves.⁸ Their founder thought that it would be a reproach to imitate the white man by plowing the ground, cutting grass for hay, and digging for stone.⁹ Let us permit Smohalla to speak for himself: "We simply take the gifts that are freely offered. We no more harm the earth than would an infant's fingers harm its mother's breast. But the white man tears up huge tracts of land, runs deep ditches, cuts down forests, and changes the whole face

⁵ H. V. Morton, *In the Steps of St. Paul* (New York, 1936), p. 334.

⁶ C. L. G. Anderson, *Old Panama and Castilla del Oro* (Boston, 1914), p. 312.

⁷ *Ibid.* See the Addendum, p. 454 *infra*.

⁸ O. O. Howard, *Nez Perce Joseph: An Account of His Ancestors, His Lands, His Confederates, His Enemies, His Murders, His War, His Pursuit and Capture* (Boston, 1881), pp. 32, 64.

⁹ James Mooney, "The Ghost-Dance Religion and the Sioux Outbreak of 1890," in *Fourteenth Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology, Part II*, p. 721.

of the earth. You know very well this is not right."¹⁰ Here, again, we see religious hostility to mutilating the earth by making trenches.

The boring of holes through mountains is likewise an undertaking fraught with danger. When the St. Gotthard Tunnel was being built Italian laborers fell sick in such numbers as to bring the work to a standstill. "The calamitous illnesses were ascribed to the evil eye or to the mountain's anger at being bored full of holes."¹¹

The sinking of a shaft into the earth in order to extract its treasures may also be attended by peril and vengeance. After deploring the sufferings which the greed of man inflicts upon earth while penetrating it in search of metals and gems, Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* ii. 158-59) thus gives vent to his feelings:

Et miramur si eadem ad noxam genuit aliqua! Ferae enim, credo, custodiunt illam arcentque *sacrilegas manus*.¹² Non inter serpentes fodimus et venas auri tractamus cum veneni radicibus? Placatiore tamen dea ob haec, quod omnes hi opulentiae exitus ad scelera caedesque et bella tendunt quodque sanguine nostro rigamus insepultisque ossibus tegimus quibus tamen velut exprobrato furore tandem ipsa se obducit et scelera quoque mortalium occultat.

Such ideas have persisted. In a work on mining, *De re metallica*, published in Latin in 1566 by Georgius Agricola, it is stated that mines were inhabited by demons of ferocious aspect and that it was the practice to expel them by prayer and fasting.¹³ Many examples of similar ideas of more recent date have been collected by William Jones, *Credulities Past and Present* (London, 1898), pp. 120-27, but I shall content myself with three quotations from other sources, two of which have to do with things American. The first one concerns exploration for oil.

Soon after the California gold rush, a community of Spiritualists settled on the Californian coast south of Santa Barbara, and named their haven "Summerland"

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 724; a striking parallel to some of the Dreamers' beliefs is to be found in part of Ovid's picture (*Met.* i. 101-2) of the Golden Age:

"Ipsa quoque immunis rastroque intacta nec ullis
Saucia vomeribus per se dabat omnia tellus."

In *Amores* iii. 3. 41 Ovid says of the same period: "Nec valido quisquam terram scindebat aratro." At a later time Tellus herself implied that enduring "the wounds of the curved plow and hoes" (*Ovid Met.* ii. 286-87) was not part of her natural functions.

¹¹ Victor Heiser, *An American Doctor's Odyssey* (New York, 1936), p. 268.

¹² It is an interesting, even if not striking, coincidence that Milton (*Paradise Lost*, I, 684-88) uses the English equivalent of this expression in telling how Mammon taught men to dig for treasure:

"... by him first
Men also, and by his suggestion taught,
Ransack'd the centre, and, with impious hands,
Rifled the bowels of their mother earth
For treasures, better hid."

¹³ Book vi; p. 217 of the translation by Herbert Clark Hoover and Lou Henry Hoover, published for the translators by the *Mining Magazine* (London: Salisbury House, 1912).

—their word for the world after death, for Paradise. Their placid beach was occasionally soiled by oil seepage, recognized by members from Pennsylvania, where petroleum exploration had begun. Scruples about tampering with Mother Earth were eventually overcome through the assurance of friendly ectoplasms. "Spirits" guided the enterprise of the community's Colonel Wayne Darling in putting the first oil well in the world through ocean water in 1896.¹⁴

Even without the support of this example I see no reason for not taking at about its face value the following paragraph in "A Millionaire of Rough and Ready," by Bret Harte:

In this emergency Mulready thought of sinking an artesian well on the sunny slope beside his house; not, however, without serious consultation and much objection from his Spanish patron. With great austerity Don Ramon pointed out that trifling with the entrails of the earth was not only an indignity to Nature almost equal to shaft-sinking and tunneling, but was a disturbance of vested interests. "I and my fathers—San Diego rest them!" said Don Ramon crossing himself—"were content with wells and cisterns, filled by Heaven at its appointed seasons; the cattle, dumb brutes though they were, knew where to find water when they wanted it. But thou sayest truly," he added with a sigh, "that was before streams and runs were choked with hellish engines, and poisoned with their spume. Go on, friend Mulready, dig and bore if thou wilt, but in a seemly fashion, and not with impious earthquakes of devilish gunpowder."¹⁵

For a final illustration of man's fear of disturbing the earth an Associated Press dispatch of March 2, 1935, may be cited:

PAILINGMAO, INNER MONGOLIA, MARCH 2 (A.P.).—Efforts to develop large coal deposits in the hills near this capital of the recently organized government of Inner Mongolia have been stopped by the opposition of the great Lama monastery here.

The monks said that "turning up the stones" would incense evil spirits of the underworld.

This means that coal must still be transported expensively 200 miles from the railhead at Paotow, although cheap coal would be a boon to the nomads who now use dried grass and dung for fuel.

To judge from these examples of engineering superstitions, it would seem that only the surface of the earth might be used with impunity by man. Any effort to penetrate beneath it might meet with divine requital. Incidentally, these beliefs enable us to understand much better the frame of mind of Gaius Memmius, to whom Lucretius dedicated his epoch-making poem:

Illud in his rebus vereor, ne forte rearis
Inpia te rationis inire elementa viamque
Indugredi sceleris.¹⁶

¹⁴ Upton Close, "More Oil from Crooked Wells," *Scientific American*, CLXI (1939), 87.

¹⁵ Bret Harte, *Marajah and Other Tales* (Vol. V of the Riverside Edition [1885]), pp. 259-60.

¹⁶ Lucretius i. 80-82.

Prying into the composition of an atom or an element might be as sacrilegious as forcible breaking of the earth's crust. At present there are some people who see lurking behind Einstein's theory of space and time "the ghastly apparition of atheism."

EUGENE S. MCCARTNEY

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NINNIUS, VINIUS, AND ONYSIUS

Horace studies have not been enriched by the addition of proper names quite unfamiliar to ancient prosopography; in the case of Ninnius, Vinus, and Onysius, there is no manuscript authority except in the case of the most suspicious of the trio, namely, Onysius. Vinus, the only name otherwise known, appears in the *Histories* (I *passim*) of Tacitus. For Ninnius there is neither manuscript authority nor external corroboration.

The name Vinus occurs in an epistle of Horace (i. 13. 2); Ninnius, in some verses of Maecenas; and Onysius, in a letter of Augustus. The last two selections are quoted by Suetonius in his *Life of Horace* (ed. Roth, pp. 297-98). The late Professor Tenney Frank¹ has already associated Augustus' letter with Horace's *Epistle*, and it is my opinion that the fragment of Maecenas should be connected with the same event that links the other two. If this is done, there are some easy and plausible emendations which simplify the text of all three passages and make unnecessary the absurd multiplication of personalities.

The *Epistle* in question is usually interpreted as a note which accompanied the presentation copy of something which Horace variously describes as *signata volumina*, *carmina*, and *libelli* and is usually identified with the first three books of the *Odes*. It contains an admonition to someone addressed in the vocative case as *vinni* or *venni* in the best manuscripts,² cautioning him not to be too clumsy in presenting the book to Augustus. Since neither Vinnius nor Vennius is a recognized Latin name, most editors³ read *Vini* on the basis of Tacitus (*op. cit.*). The point of the *Epistle* is that this fellow is an ass and, in that capacity, a true son of his father, whose *cognomen* is said to be *Asina*. Although the manuscript heading of the *Epistle* frequently reads *Asella*, there is no reason to doubt the authenticity of *Asina* which, we know from Macrobius,⁴ was a *cognomen* current in the Cornelian gens.

This very legitimate *cognomen* furnishes a real clue to the obvious corruption in *vinni* or *venni*: if we ask what the Romans would call the son of a she-ass, Varro⁵ and Pliny⁶ both answer *hinnus*, the alleged offspring of a

¹ *Catullus and Horace* (New York, 1928), p. 240.

² Cf. Garrod's second edition of Wickham's Oxford text; *vinni* apparently corrects Vollmer's *vinui* in his note to the Teubner text.

³ Sic Vollmer, Wickham, Garrod, etc.

⁴ *Sat.* i. 6. 29.

⁵ *RR* ii. 8. 1; 6.

⁶ *HN* viii. 44.

jenny and a stallion, as opposed to a *mulus* born from the union of a jack and a mare. *Venni* and *vinni* are presumably variant corrections of a vocative form *hinne*, which, spelled in capitals with a smudged *H*, someone in the reign of Claudius or under the influence of Claudian spelling⁷ restored as an inverted digamma, 𐌺 , by adding a horizontal instead of a vertical stroke to 𐌹 .⁸ When the digamma was changed to *V*, the impossible form *vinne* was altered variously, on the assumption that it must be a proper name.

The restoration *hinne* is supported by the language which Horace uses in addressing his messenger: he talks of a "pack" (*sarcina*, l. 6), "pack-saddles" (*clitellas*, l. 8), a "burden fixed so" (*sic positum . . . onus*, l. 12), and a "bundle" (*fasciculum*, l. 13); the words *uret* (l. 6), *sudavisse* (l. 16), and *titubet* (l. 19) and the expression (l. 10) *viribus uteris per clivos, flumina, lamas* suggest the activities of an ass or of a man addressed as such. And if I am right, it cannot be just an animal, because in that case its mother, not its father, would be called *asina*.

Further confirmation for the reading *hinne* may be gathered from the letter of Augustus quoted by Suetonius (ed. Roth, p. 298), if that document is, indeed, a note acknowledging the receipt of the same book or books dispatched by Horace with the *Epistle*. For Augustus chides his poet laureate with a remark that the book is quite as short as its author, and even thinner; and he suggests that to make it fatter Horace might inscribe it on a pint pot. Augustus calls the *volumen* a *libellus* (not *libelli*) and complains of its meager proportions; whereas Horace gives the impression that it is a ponderous tome. This contradiction suggests irony on one side or the other, and Horace is probably the guilty one. Now such irony appears in Roman literature when circumstances contain either a marked incongruity or a manifest congruity: Juvenal (viii. 32-33) laughs at a dwarf called Atlas or at a Negro named Mr. Swan, while Martial (vi. 77) pokes fun at the same dwarf on a donkey or at a black man on a black elephant. I am trying to suggest that Horace's messenger was either very large or very small; and, if the latter is the case, there is an additional reason for addressing him as *hinnus*. For, outside of its parentage, one of the few facts we know about this fanciful beast is that it was supposed to be remarkably small. Horace has put his tiny book into the hands of a midget, who is incidentally the son of a Mr. She-Ass, so quite appropriately he gives him the title *hinnus* and laughs at the ridiculous size assumed in his hands by the miniature book.

I doubt very much if the courier's real name is *Onysius*, although the manuscripts favor that reading and Professor Frank⁹ sees in it a play on *ōvos*. Until quite recently most editors found it difficult to accept, and it was most successfully emended to *Dionysius*.¹⁰ However, the mention of a *cognomen*

⁷ Cf. Suetonius *Div. Claud.* 41

⁸ Or else 𐌺 was understood as the Claudian symbol for the sound between *u* and *i* and so was emended to *u*.

⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 286, n. 25.

¹⁰ By Nannius (*Onesimus* [Glaeser]).

in Horace rules out a Greek name, and this emendation has been rightly rejected by modern editors. I would suggest that *onysius* is a corruption of *onustus*, modifying a subject which does not explicitly appear in the excerpt quoted by Suetonius; the pun, if one exists, may then be turned by "bur(ro)dened" (on *onustus* as if <δύος + ρος). The irony expressed in *onustus* would be exactly in keeping with the tone of Horace's *Epistle* and, no doubt, an intentional reminiscence of it.

And perhaps the poet's patron, as well as the poet's prince, was tickled by the same joke, when he wrote to Horace those verses which run in the best manuscripts of Suetonius:

Ni te visceribus meis, Horati,
Plus iam diligo, tu tuum sodalem
Nimio videas strigiosorem.

Ninnio, the P. Pithoeus emendation of the meaningless *nimio*,¹¹ has been adopted by the most recent editor,¹² who explains in a note that nothing else is known of *Ninnius* except that he was "notorious for his leanness"! Pleonasm of this sort convinces me that he is also fictitious, especially since there is no manuscript authority for that spelling of his name: the reading nearest *ninnio* is *ninio*,¹³ which no editor has yet had the courage to accept.

Lambinus was the first to drop a good hint, which has since been discarded, quite needlessly, because of later orthographic developments, apparently understood only in part by the editors of Suetonius. Lambinus read *hinno me* for *nimio*, and Oudendorp improved upon this to read *hinnulo*. These emendations were generally accepted and appeared in the older Latin dictionaries, along with the information that *hinnus* was a loan word from the Greek (ἵννος) transferred in the form *ginnus*. Consequently, when the aspirate was discredited for the Greek word, Roth lost confidence and changed *hinnulo* to *innulo*. Now in Latin there is no manuscript authority either for *ginnus* or for *innulus*; there is such authority for *hinnus*, *hinnulus*,¹⁴ and also *innus*,¹⁵ and *innus* is a loan word, for Pliny presents it most directly as a transliteration of the Greek word. But *hinnus* and *hinnulus* are native Latin words, and, according to Pliny, they refer to quite a different beast: a *hinnus* or *hinnulus* is the offspring of a jenny and a stallion; the *innus*, of a mare and a sport of nature, the fertile *mulus*. I would, therefore, in the text of Suetonius go back, in part, to the readings so recklessly abandoned and read *hinno illo*, which with elision fits the meter of the epigram and carries a clear reference to the person of the *Epistle*. Horace warns his "son-of-a-she-ass" about becoming a parable, and that is exactly what happens—Maecenas' phrase elevates the thin fellow with his thin book to the plane of the proverbial.

TUFTS COLLEGE

VAN JOHNSON

¹¹ The best manuscripts read *nimio*, although Roth reports *mimo*, *minio*, *muno*, and *ninio*.

¹² Professor J. C. Rolfe in the Loeb edition of 1930 (II, 485, n. a).

¹³ Cod. Parisinus 7974. ¹⁴ Cf. Varro *loc. cit.* and Pliny *loc. cit.* ¹⁵ Pliny *loc. cit.*

NEW FRAGMENTS OF CICERO'S *DE RE PUBLICA*

In *De civ. Dei* xix. 21 Augustine reverts to the task to which he has devoted a good deal of energy in the first books of the work, namely, the refutation of the notion of "iustitia" put forward by Cicero in *De re publica* iii: "Quapropter nunc est locus ut quam potero breviter ac dilucide expediam . . . secundum definitiones quibus apud Ciceronem utitur Scipio in libris de re publica nunquam rem publicam fuisse Romanam." He is going to refute Cicero through Cicero. Thus, we are not surprised to find him in the next sentences referring to Scipio's definitions of "res publica" and of "populus." These definitions have been duly incorporated by the editors of *De re publica* among the fragments of Book iii. Yet, unless Augustine departed from his original intention, the sentence "Iustitia porro ea virtus est quae suum cuique tribuit" (xix. 21; p. 390, l. 15 [Dombart-Kalb]) must also be a quotation from *De re pub.* iii; for he uses this definition in the same way and to the same end as the others, insisting that the Roman state failed to live up to it. So far from "suum cuique tribuere," they denied God what is God's. There would be no point in Augustine's argument unless we assume that this actually was Scipio's definition in his great speech in *De re pub.* iii. And, after all, we have his word that he is proceeding "secundum definitiones quibus apud Ciceronem utitur Scipio." This is not the place to go into the history of this definition of "iustitia," which was adopted by Ulpian (*Dig.* i. 1. 10), found a place at the beginning of the *Institutiones* and was in the Middle Ages echoed by Dante in *De monarchia* and by many other writers.¹ It will suffice to note that Cicero shows his familiarity with it in *De inv.* ii. 160; *De legg.* i. 19; *De nat. deor.* iii. 38; *De off.* i. 15. He refers to it also in the "doxographic" exposition at the beginning of Book iii (sec. 10), which we know through Lactantius. Yet, it is one thing to mention the definition in a historical account among a variety of approaches and another to make the principal character adopt it as the basis of his discussion.

I started by citing the first sentence of chapter xxi. In chapter xx Augustine contrasts the "bona aeterna" with "res ista," our earthly existence. The last sentence of this chapter contains his judgment on the "res ista":

Non veris animi bonis utitur quoniam non est vera sapientia quae intentionem suam in his quae prudenter discernit, gerit fortiter, cohibet temperanter iusteque distribuit non ad illum dirigit finem ubi erit Deus omnia in omnibus, aeternitate certa et pace perfecta.

The description of the activities of the earthly "sapientia" is astonishingly concrete. I do not pretend to have any definite evidence that Augustine borrowed the description from a pagan writer, but I think it will be well to bear in mind (1) that Cicero endowed his "rector" or "princeps" with the four Pla-

¹ Cf. Leopold Wenger, "Suum cuique in antiken Urkunden" in *Aus der Geisteswelt des Mittelalters* (Münster i. W., 1935), pp. 1415-25, and, more generally, Felix Senn, *Les Origines de la notion de jurisprudence* (Paris, 1926), *passim*.

tonic cardinal virtues² (which Plato himself had divided among the different classes), (2) that the four virtues are not among the Platonic dogmas which the Neo-Platonists were anxious to revive, and (3) that this sentence marks the transition to Augustine's final refutation of Cicero's political theories. For good reasons Augustine reserved the mention of Cicero and his work to the next sentence,³ but this should not stop us from recognizing that the words "prudenter discernit, gerit fortiter, cohibet temperanter iusteque distribuit" are a hit at the *De re publica*. They indicate (more definitely than the fragments quoted in n. 2) how Cicero expected his "rector" to employ each of his four Platonic virtues. "Iusteque distribuit" recalls the definition of "iustitia" which we have just vindicated for Book iii.

OLIVET COLLEGE, MICHIGAN

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

PLATO CRATYLUS 398 c-e: TRANSLATION AND INTERPRETATION

HERMOGENES: But the hero. What would he be?

SOCRATES: This is not hard to see; for their name, indicating its origin from *ἔρως*, has been but slightly changed (*παρήκται*).

HERM.: How do you mean?

SOC.: Do you not know heroes are demigods?

HERM.: Well, what then?

SOC.: All have probably fallen in love (*γεγόνασιν ἐρασθέντες*)¹ either as gods with a mortal woman or as mortals with a goddess. If you examine this in the early Attic, you will understand it better. For it will show that in addition to the word *ἔρως* from which heroes have been derived (*γεγόνασιν*),² there has been a slight change (*παρηγμένον ἔστιν*) favoring respectability (*δνόματος χάριν*).³

¹ Cf. *De re pub.* vi. 1. 6 (Macr. in *Somn. Scip.* i. 1. 8).

² Notice "quapropter" at the beginning of this sentence.

³ The text followed here is that of manuscripts lettered by Schanz as B, G, H, P, T: πάντες δῆπον γεγόνασιν ἐρασθέντες ἢ θεοὶ θνητῆς ἢ θνητοὶ θεᾶς. In spite of the very high authority of these MSS, modern editors have preferred a reading that involved a genitive absolute—ἐρασθέντος . . . θεοῦ . . . θνητοῦ—and that was seen by an "anonymous" in the now lost Gudianus 44. This "anonymous" made a transposition of two of the words, and in this form it stands in the editions of Heindorf, Bekker, Stallbaum, Schanz, Burnet, etc. A correction in Schanz's G is somewhat similar. Modern editors probably preferred this reading of the "Anonymous" because it squared with one definition of "heroes"—"children of gods"—as in *Laws* 853 c¹ θεῶν παῖσιν . . . τοῖς ἥρωσιν.

² A second *γεγόνασιν* occurs here in the sense of "etymologically derived"—a meaning common in the *Cratylus*. Its occurrence here has misled editors into thinking that both verbs should have the same meaning. However, there is an evident purpose to attain variety of expression in this entire passage. This is shown by the use of *παρήκται* and later *παρηγμένον ἔστιν* as synonymous.

³ *δνόματος χάριν* is called "*sine dubio corruptum*" by Schanz and variously emended by others. But this use of *δνομα* needs only to be compared with that of *Apol.* 34 e¹: τηλικόνδε ὄντα καὶ τοῦτο τοῦνομα ἔχοντα.

Either this change denotes "heroes," as already stated, or that they were clever and "orators" and men keen of mind and fond of disputations (*διαλεκτικοί*), being able to frame questions (*ἐρωτᾶν*):⁴ for *εἶρειν* is *λέγειν* (so that *ἐρωτητικός* conforms in its meaning with *διαλεκτικός*). Thus, in the (early) Attic, mentioned above, heroes, orators, and framers of questions coincide in their names (*λεγόμενοι*) and so the tribe of heroes is also the orators' and sophists' clan.

But there were other kinds of heroes—the numerous and legendary eponymi, Theseus, Cadmus, Amphiaraus, Anchises—not of divine descent. The better reading probably uses the word in still another and more Platonic sense. The intent of the derivation is to make heroes lovers. It is, in the active, what the derivation "*Ἦρα δὲ ἐρατὴ τις* of 404 b⁹ is, in the passive. This trend of thought is continued in the *Symposium*. Love is basically a desire for immortality (207 a³). It is of two kinds (206 c²), of soul and of body. He who can see the divinely beautiful is a friend of god and as near as man can come to immortality (211e, 212a).

The better reading needs the combining of *γεγόνασιν ἐρασθέντες* into one periphrastic form meaning "have fallen in love." This rather rare use of *γίγνομαι* to make periphrastic tenses is noted in Ast's *Lexicon* under the head of this verb. One of his examples has both verbs in the perfect: *γεγόνασιν διηραγασμένοι*, *Laws* 670 b¹⁰. Several have both verbs in the aorist, as might be expected, but none are exactly like this case from the *Cratylus*. To the list of Ast may be added *συμπλακὲν γίγνεσθαι* (*Politicus* 311 b⁷). This periphrastic form in the *Cratylus* is probably what has caused the scholium of B at this place: *σημείωσαι διὰ σύνταξιν*.

GEORGE B. HUSSEY

DE LAND, FLORIDA

THE *DAIMONION* OF SOCRATES

The passages in the genuine dialogues of Plato which treat of the *Daimonion* of Socrates are all perfectly consistent one with the other. It is a kind of "voice" which, at any moment when he is about to perform some action, suddenly arrests him and warns him to refrain. It is not the voice of conscience, since in no one of the cases cited can the action contemplated be considered as involving a moral decision—and for this reason most of the parallels which used to be quoted fail to satisfy the student. The following experience, which, to the best of my belief, has not been brought forward by any commentator, seems to bear a very close resemblance to the *Daimonion* of Socrates:

I had a mind to write to her; but I felt as I have often felt before in great crises, a restraint which was gentle and incomprehensible, but nevertheless unmistakable.

⁴ In this chain of derivatives from *ἔρω*s—viz., *ἥρωας*, *ῥήτορες*, *ἐρωτᾶν*—and in the similar chain in the next sentence—*ἥρωες*, *ῥήτορες*, *ἐρωτητικοί*—nothing is said about the change from *ἥρ-* to *ῥή-* in order to produce the middle link. Perhaps it was too obvious for one who could handle etymology as Socrates does. It required no more dexterity on his part than deriving *πῦρ* from *Φρύξ* (410 a⁴).

I suppose it is not what would be called conscience, as conscience is supposed to decide solely between right and wrong, but it was none the less peremptory, although its voice was so soft and low that it might easily have been overlooked. Over and over again, when I have purposed doing a thing, have I been impeded or arrested by this same silent monitor, and never have I known its warnings to be the mere false alarms of fancy.

The writer of this passage is William Hale White, whose literary works, published under the name of Mark Rutherford, are still read with appreciation by many readers who are sensitive to a very simple and very beautiful prose style. The author was a man of deep religious feeling, and his novels have a peculiar interest for those who wish to learn something about the Victorian revolt from traditional religion. The *Autobiography of Mark Rutherford*, in which the passage quoted above appears, was first printed in 1881; it was reprinted in a convenient pocket edition, along with his other novels, by Fisher Unwin, Ltd., in 1923. The quotation occurs on page 132 of this edition.

W. D. WOODHEAD

McGILL UNIVERSITY
MONTREAL

ANOTHER NOTE ON PROPERTIUS I. 22

The reinterpretation of Propertius i. 22 by Agnes Kirsopp Lake in *Classical Philology*, July, 1940, is suggestive, imaginative, and well reasoned. I regret that in the last paragraph Dr. Lake felt it almost necessary to apologize for "venturing too far into the dangerous field of psychological interpretation" in tracing Propertius' interest in the accurate visualization of death "to the incident described in i. 22, which took place during his childhood."

The Introduction to the Butler-Barber edition of Propertius (1933) emphasizes the effect of the horrors of the siege of Perugia on the child's imagination, testified to both by i. 21 and 22 and by iv. 1. 129-30 (on the subsequent confiscation of his father's farm). And in my book *Romance in the Latin Elegiac Poets* (1932) I had previously analyzed fully Propertius' visualization of death in twenty-three poems and had attributed his sensitivity to its horrors to his childhood experiences of war near his home. My chapter on Propertius, which Dr. Lake seems not to have read, thus anticipated her hesitant suggestion.

ELIZABETH HAZELTON HAIGHT

VASSAR COLLEGE

BOOK REVIEWS

Philonis Alexandrini in Flaccum. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by HERBERT BOX. London: Oxford University Press, 1939. Pp. lxii+129.

An adequate commentary on Philo's two historical works—the *In Flaccum* and the *Legatio ad Gaium*—has long been an acutely felt desideratum for ancient historians. It is in part supplied by this excellent and full edition of the smaller treatise, and all students of the subject must join in the hope expressed by Dr. Bell in his Preface (p. vii) that Box will be encouraged to edit the *Legatio* with equal completeness and adequacy. The only other edition known—that of Johann Christian Wilhelm Dahl, published in 1802 with Latin notes—was unavailable to Box. There is no copy even in the British Museum. A copy, however, forms part of the splendid Philo collection of Howard L. Goodhart, of New York, and is numbered 409 in his "Bibliography of Philo" (Goodhart and Goodenough, "General Bibliography of Philo," printed with E. R. Goodenough, *The Politics of Philo Judaeus* [1938], pp. 190–91). I owe to Goodhart's kindness an opportunity to consult the only predecessor of the present work, which the most recent of Philo's editors, S. Reiter, praised highly. Its notes cannot be compared in fulness to those of this edition, but some of them are valuable supplements. For example, in relation to the rule that prohibited soldiers from engaging in nonmilitary employment he aptly quotes II Tim. 2:4—a passage of importance in the later Christian contrast between the *paganus* or civilian with the *miles Christi*. And again under section 4 in regard to the ill-repute of Egyptians, he cites Curtius iv. 1; Plin. *Pan.* 31; Suet. *Caes.* 38; Theocr. *Id.* xv. 48; and especially the fragment of Aeschylus (Dind. 312), *δαινοὶ πλέκειν μηχανὰς Αἰγύπτιοι*, which was frequently cited in ancient times. Steph. Byz., *s.v.* Αἰγύπτιοι; Suidas, *s.v.* δαινοί, and in the Scholiast to the Theocritean passage mentioned as well as to Arist. *Nub.* 1130. Valckenaer in his comment on Theocritus has a full collection of similar references to Egyptians.

Neither the *In Flaccum* nor the *Legatio* has yet appeared in the Loeb *Philo*, although at the rate at which Colson is carrying on this admirable edition we may expect its completion within a few years.

Box gives us a fifty-page introduction which contains the historical background of the *In Flaccum* and a concise statement of some of the most controversial of the issues involved. In the notes a great many other questions are raised, which are illustrated with a wealth of matters derived from the huge increments that inscriptions and papyri have made to our source material since the time of Dahl.

The higher criticism of the text is found on pages xxxv-xxxvii. Box—I think rightly—accepts the Massebieau-Cohn theory which makes the *In Flaccum* wholly separate from the *Legatio* and not, as Schürer thought, one division of a five-part work dealing with the Gaian persecution, the *Legatio* being another division. As far as the text is concerned, it is that of Cohn-Wendland-Reiter. For a renewed textual examination we shall doubtless have to await Colson's edition.

The chief historical controversy discussed in the Introduction is the perennial question of the citizenship of the Alexandrine Jews. On this, of course, the new *locus classicus* is no longer the passage of Josephus *BJ* ii. 487 and *Contra Apionem* ii. 35, but the papyrus edited by H. Idris Bell in *Jews and Christians in Egypt* (1924). It seems, however, extraordinary that the matter continues to be put, even by Box (pp. xxi ff.), in a manner that misses the point.

It scarcely needs proof that all Jews who came to Alexandria at various times did not become *Alexandrini*. Josephus nowhere says so. That some Jews were certainly *Alexandrini* and were such with privileges of abstention from duties which violated their religious scruples seems demonstrable. Josephus asserts that those who were originally settled there by Alexander and the early Ptolemies had precisely this status, and, despite confident assertion to the contrary, there is nothing in the papyri to contradict this statement.

How many Jews of this status there were in the time of Philo it would be impossible to say. But that there were a great many who did not possess it would be a priori likely and is now specifically attested. And that of these non-citizen, immigrant Jews a great many were improperly registered as citizens is equally likely and equally attested. Athens and Rome had the same problem in relation to all their groups of foreigners. Philo's denunciation of the pogrom which Flaccus may have permitted rather than ordered hardly needs qualification by reason of these facts.

Box is at some pains to indicate an absence of anti-Jewish bias in his treatment of the problem. That may well be by way of compensation for such high-handed dealing with history as that of which Hugo Willrich is constantly guilty. Certainly, no bias is discernible in Box—a fact, which except for the evil example of Willrich and those of his kidney, it would be unnecessary to mention.

In this connection it might be well to suggest that (p. 79) Philo calls the Alexandrian anti-Semites Egyptians and not Greeks, not merely because he wishes to abuse them but because they almost certainly were Egyptians and not Greeks. Willrich's statements on the point (*Judaica* [1928], p. 130) do not reach the dignity of an argument.

Evidently, on specific points Box's views will not be those of some of his readers. But on all the matters he discusses in his notes he makes valuable and suggestive comments. On page 90 he raises an issue which is certainly worth the attention of students of both medical history and classical antiqui-

ties. What was the concept—or better, what were the concepts?—of madness which were current in the ancient world? In this connection he cites a communication of Dorothy Paschall (p. 89), a young American scholar of great promise whose untimely death was a real loss to the study of ancient society.

In connection with Philo's statements on the desecration of the emperor's birthday (sec. 81, p. 105), which Philo carefully calls the *γενέθλιος*, it might have been useful to note the reference to the *γενέσια* in the Mishna, Aboda Zara (ed. Strack), I, 3, p. 2, n. 9). Box's citation from *BGU* (p. 47) also refers to the *γενέσια*, which is properly the celebration of the birthday of deceased persons but was later identified with the *γενέθλιος* (cf. Herod. 4. 26; and Preisigke *Wörterbuch*, s.v., II, 286, and III, 371). Philo never uses *γενέσια*. The point is discussed in Franz Poland's *Griechisches Vereinswesen* (1908)—a book which must be added to the authorities cited (pp. 72-73). The best discussion is still that of Wilhelm Schmidt, *Geburtstag im Altertum* (1908), pp. 55-84. Philo's sense of the outrage suggests a very different attitude from what must have been the orthodox view as depicted in the Mishna and Tosefta (10a) and otherwise attested in Jewish tradition. That Philo belonged to that part of the Jewish community that was unmistakably pro-Roman and, from the religious point of view, less rigorous is clear from all that can be gathered from his writings. We have direct evidence for the presence of at least two major factions among the Jews, and the cleavage can hardly have been otherwise than on the attitude toward the Mosaic law and the Halaka. It might be well to recall this fact in connection with the Alexandrians in general. That the imperial family "must have been unpopular as representatives of Roman rule" (p. 81) is too strong a statement. There was probably a strong pro-Roman party among the upper classes, who haughtily distinguished themselves from the Egyptians proper. The reference to the special character of Alexandrine citizenship in the correspondence of Trajan and Pliny (*Epp.* x. 5. 6, 7), "secundum institutionem principum," ought perhaps to qualify the statements of the Introduction (p. xiii).

What is least satisfactory in Box's edition is his translation. His version contains pretentious phrases and words that have no real warrant in Philo's style. Philo's Greek is quite within the idiom of his time. It is still worth while consulting Carl Siegfried, *Philo von Alexandria* (1875) (pp. 31-137) and Julius Jessen, *De elocutione Philonis Alex.* (Sauppe Festschr., pp. 1-12). Greek was the only language he really commanded, even if he may have had a smattering of Hebrew and perhaps knew enough Aramaic to communicate with some of the motley Syrians—Jews and non-Jews—who were constantly sifting into the capital of the East. The old translation of C. D. Yonge gives, I think, a better picture of how Philo expressed himself.

Philo's character and person, it cannot be denied, are not shown to advantage in the attack on Flaccus. While we must allow much for the justifiable indignation produced by the horrors of the pogrom, it is clear that indignation is not a safe emotion for historical writing. We cannot assume that the

In Flaccum furnishes a reliable account of either Flaccus or the social background of the incidents depicted. Nonetheless it is a source of prime importance. There is much that can be derived from this treatise for authentic history, and Box's Introduction and Notes are ample demonstrations of this fact.

University of California
Berkeley, California

MAX RADIN

Charitonis Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo. Recensuit et emendavit WARREN E. BLAKE. Oxonii e typographeo Clarendoniano MCMXXXVIII. Pp. xx+142. \$3.50.

At last we have a good text of Chariton, prepared by an editor who has actually seen the manuscript.¹ It is an extraordinary fact that the four previous editors (D'Orville, Beck, Hirschig, and Hercher) have all used the collations of other scholars. The results, likewise, have sometimes been extraordinary.

Hercher's edition of the *Erotici Graeci*, hitherto the standard text, has long been out of print and hard to obtain. Moreover, his text of Chariton is very poor, containing twenty lacunae, and is regarded as corrupt by its editor in four other places. The House of Teubner projected a revision more than twenty-five years ago under Mewaldt's editorship, but nothing ever came of it. This new edition is therefore very welcome.

Several advantages have accrued to Blake in the years since Hercher published his edition. Chief of these are the increase in our knowledge of the Koiné, our greater familiarity with the literary language of the early Christian centuries, and the discovery in Egypt of fragments of three different manuscripts of Chariton's own work, one as early as the second Christian century. These last, to be sure, are small, amounting altogether, according to Blake's calculation (p. x), to but one-thirtieth of the whole book; but they furnish important data and incidentally increase our respect for F; for the earliest differ no more from it than is often the case with contemporary manuscripts (p. xii). A fourth aid Blake had in his work was an "index verborum plenissimus" to his author, which he made himself and hopes to publish soon. This has been an invaluable guide to Chariton's usage in weighing textual suggestions made by the several editors and others, as is shown in his apparatus criticus.

Blake has made full use of all these aids. He has deeply studied Chariton's own style and has made himself familiar with later Greek, both literary and colloquial. References may be found in his notes to parallels not only elsewhere in his author, but also in the other Greek romances, the New Testament, Lucian, and others to justify his readings. He has also utilized the Atticizing grammarians.

¹ Codex Abbazia Fiorentina 2728 (referred to as F).

His apparatus criticus, placed at the foot of the page where it belongs, has been prepared with great care. It is in two parts, of which the first deals with his own text in relation to F; in the second his purpose was to include everything put forward by critics, except such offerings as they would never have proposed if they had had the true reading of F before them. In this he has succeeded almost perfectly. A large amount of verifying revealed only a very few conjectures not found in his apparatus and those of little moment. Scholars interested in improving the text may therefore feel confident that they have here all the needed information about emendations proposed to date. This is a great convenience, for it is illuminating to notice in such a study how often critics rush into print with suggestions made long before. Even since the publication of this edition a well-known scholar has ferreted out a lacuna and filled it with a proposal offered in 1874 by Hilberg and duly recorded by Blake.²

The text itself is very satisfactory. Of the twenty lacunae left in his text by Hercher, as mentioned above, Blake has eliminated all but three. In most cases the insertion of one word was all that was needed, and usually the missing word had already been found by some earlier student. Five of the corrections are Blake's,³ most of them excellent, all of them satisfactory. Of the other four "corrupt" places noted by Hercher (iii. 1. 4; iii. 5. 6; iii. 9. 11; iv. 5. 9) the second and fourth stand here unchanged and unchallenged; the third has been corrected by a slight change; the first on the list is marked by obeli.⁴ Of the three remaining lacunae, one (i. 1. 6) is due to the illegibility of the first leaf of the manuscript and will probably never be filled until another codex is discovered; at another (vi. 4. 6) the scribe seems to have taken a vacation and begun again at the wrong point; for the third (vi. 3. 1) Blake has a very plausible proposal in his notes but hesitated to incorporate it into his text. At two other places he indicates lacunae not mentioned by Hercher; one (vii. 6. 7) is probably due to the loss of a leaf (so Hilberg, "Blattverlust"; Blake says "lacunam esse totius fere paginae") of the archetype. To these breaks we must add four passages obelized by the editor in addition to the one just mentioned. At one of these (vii. 5. 5), it seems to this reviewer, something must have been lost from the text; for the introduction of Rhodogune⁵ here is quite pointless. Each of the rest concerns only one word. Plenty of

² H. J. Rose, *Class. Quart.*, XXXIII (1939), 30. The passage is vi. 2. 10.

³ i. 4. 1; ii. 3. 7; iii. 3. 3; v. 6. 5; vii. 5. 12.

⁴ Would not (ἀνάγκη) after *τοσαύτη* satisfy the passage? Callirhoe wants Dionysius as a husband so that she may rear her child. ἀνάγκη is common in the LXX in the sense of "distress" and is cited also from Simonides, N.T., and Diodorus, as well as an inscription from Amorgos (third century B.C., *IG*, XII, 7, 386. 23). ἀπορία would not meet paleographic objections, but ἀνάγκη might.

⁵ Blake has it "Rhodogyne" in the Index nominum, though in the text it appears always as Ῥοδολογύνη in F. Reiske in his Latin version uses the form "Rhodogune."

suggestions have been offered for their correction, but none that pleased Blake. From this standpoint, then, this text is a great advance on Hercher's.

Chariton has excited the interest of many scholars who have tried their hands at emending. In the first book alone, omitting the abnormal portion at the beginning where the writing can hardly be read, Blake has incorporated over one hundred emendations into his text—an average of almost five to a standard Teubner page—and rejected about three hundred, or more than fourteen to a page. This indicates the magnitude of his task in sifting possible readings. Eighteen of those accepted in Book i are his own. In the whole work he uses one hundred and six of his own proposals, about one-third involving particles or the article or similar minor words; ten or eleven are alterations in case affecting only one word, and half a dozen more in mood, tense, or voice. This leaves about half, made up of additions or substitutions of more important parts of speech. Most of them better the reading, though in some instances one feels, as Blake himself says about a certain choice between F and one of the Egyptian fragments: "Inter has duas lectiones delectus difficilis."

Perhaps his most ambitious emendation is at ii. 2. 2, where at least nine scholars had attempted a reconstruction. The passage is too long to quote here. A hint by Gasda and Blake's discovery of parallels in Alciphron and Aristaenetos have led to a sure restoration of Chariton's words. At ii. 9. 3 the unintelligible πασῶν ἀσεβᾶναι of F is altered to ἰάσων ἀσελγαίνει—a tempting suggestion since καὶ Μηδείας λαμβάνεις λογισμοῖς are the words that immediately follow. At v. 5. 9 ἐπὶ τραύματι ἐρωτικῷ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἐπιθυμίας . . . ἐλάμβανε πλῆγην is a happy change from ἐπὶ τι θαῦμα ἐρωτικὸν τὴν παλαιὰν ἐπιθυμίαν, based on viii. 5. 6. An ingenious change is καλῶς to κάλως in πρὶν κάλως τὴν ναῦν καταχθῆναι (viii. 5. 5); cf. Poll. On. i. 113: ἐκ κάλων ἔλκοντες τὴν ναῦν. φράση for φράσοι (v. 8. 2), where Hercher has φράσειεν, introduces a "potential subjunctive," of which there are three undoubted instances in F (iv. 1. 11; viii. 1. 14; viii. 4. 1), all emended out by Cobet; see Blake's article "Modal Usage in Chariton," *AJP*, LVII (1936), 10-23.⁶

At v. 6. 8 F's ἡ δὲ σὴ τύχη, βασιλεῦ, ἄξιον ὄντα κατέστησε, retained by Hercher, has been suspected by many. Blake proposes a remedy strikingly different from all the rest: ἡ δὲ σή, Τύχη, <βασκανία> βασιλέα κτλ., taking a hint from several passages in which Callirhoe apostrophizes Tyche and uses the epithet βάσκανε. The address to Fortune is tempting, especially with τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν in the next line; but I question whether he has found the solution of the difficulty. Callirhoe regularly uses the term in reproach, while

⁶ This is an excellent example of the editor's support of F. Many others could be cited, but a few must suffice: Potential indicative without ἄν (vi. 10. 6); πρὶν with the subjunctive (without ἄν) (v. 7. 1); ἐγὼ τε (ii. 1. 4), where Hercher deletes τε; τριηράρχας at viii. 2. 9, where Hercher reads τριηράρχους; ἐκείδεκα at iv. 2. 6; ἐκάθητο (i. 4. 11), where Hercher to maintain consistency has καθῆστο, which is found everywhere else in this author; πολὺν πολὺν (vii. 5. 12).

here Dionysius is pleased at what Tyche has done to foil the machinations of Mithridates. Another daring proposal comes at vii. 6. 10, where Chaeareas' orderly reports that Callirhoe has thrown herself on the ground and refuses to budge; the words in F are *τὴν γὰρ γυναῖκα ἣν εὗρον ἐν πλαταίαις τεταγμένην*. Blake proposes <ὡς> ἐν Πλαταίαις and explains in his note: "i.e., Calirhoës 'ἐγκρατεῖαν θαυμαστήν' attingit Aegyptius, cf. Plut. *Vit. Aristid.* c. 17.7." It is hardly in character for an Egyptian to speak with such knowledge of the details of Greek history—one would not expect George Washington's cherry tree to be known abroad—but otherwise the emendation is excellent; and rhetoric loves such allusions.

At vii. 3. 6 n. Blake says: "*βασιλεὺς δὲ* fortasse <ὁ> δὲ βασιλεὺς, rex enim Aegyptius est; variabilis tamen in hac re Charitonis usus." In view of this statement the following figures are interesting. In Books iv, v, and vi, where the king of Persia is prominent, I counted ninety-five instances of *βασιλεὺς* (omitting vocatives, *οἱ βασιλεῖς* = "king and queen," vi. 1. 6, and vi. 8. 2 as not pertinent). Of these, seventy-six lack the article in F, followed by Blake; five have the article, but Blake (following Hercher) brackets it; these five examples are all in Books iv and v. In fourteen cases Blake retains the article of F, in seven of which Hercher brackets it; all but two of these are in Book vi. Of the fourteen, four are instances of *ὁ μέγας βασιλεὺς*; one is *διὰ σὲ τὸν βασιλέα*; and one (vi. 4. 1) *αὐτὸς ὁ βασιλεὺς* with which compare vi. 9. 6 *αὐτῷ βασιλεῖ* and v. 4. 4 *αὐτῷ [τῷ] βασιλεῖ*. (One of the fourteen, vi. 7. 12, may perhaps be left out as possibly debatable; Hercher deletes the article here.) No reason for these variations in practice appears.

It is unfortunate that Blake did not note in the margin the page numbers of the edition of Hercher, and perhaps of Hirschig's too. Many scholars refer to Chariton by page and line of one of these editions.

Misprints are few and not likely to cause trouble. At i. 11. 7 F's *Συρακουσίων* is retained, though elsewhere Blake follows Cobet and a fragment with *Συρακοσ-*. *ἤκουσεν* appears for *ἤκουσεν* (iii. 1. 4). Besides these there are a few insignificant slips, mostly in the notes. At ii. 9. 2 Blake (with Hercher) punctuates with a full stop after *πατέρα*. An interrogation point is better; Blake so translates. Blake has the support of the new Liddell and Scott for *ἄβρα* (i. 4. 1, 9; i. 5. 1), but Hesychius (*s.v.* *ἄβρα*) and the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (ii. 5, 6) reject it and insist on *ἄβρα*. So also the *Συν. λεξ. χρησ.* ap. Bekker's *Anecd.* ccxxii. 12, and now the new Suidas (*s.v.* *ἄβρα*, *ἄβραι*).

There is a Praefatio on the history of the text (pp. vii–xix), including a bibliography of critical works on Chariton; an "Index analyticus nominum propriorum" is added, with lists (140–142) of "Sententiae variae" and "Similitudines." An "Index Graecitatis" is omitted because of the "Index verborum plenissimus" mentioned before.

DONALD BLYTHE DURHAM

Hamilton College

⁷ Under "Homerus" is omitted a reference to *Il.* vi. 474 at H 5. 15.

La Letteratura di Roma repubblicana ed Augustea. By AUGUSTO ROSTAGNI. ("Storia di Roma," Vol. XVII.) Bologna: Licinio Cappelli, 1939. Pp. 514.

This volume is one of thirty, now being prepared under the auspices of the Istituto di Studi Romani, which are intended, so says the announcement, to be "the definitive Roman and Italian History of Rome." They will present not only the factual history of the city from its origin down to and including these latter days but also the story of its law, its religion, its art, its language, and its literature—all the elements, in short, which go to make up history in its broadest sense. Each volume will be the work of a specialist in the field with which it is concerned, and all the contributors are men who have already won repute by their scholarly contributions. Two volumes will be devoted to the history of Rome's literature—the one now under review and a complementary volume by Professor A. G. Amatucci, "The Literature of Imperial Rome," which has not yet been published.

Since these volumes are to set forth the new Rome's interpretation of old Rome, they are obviously designed to appeal chiefly to the understanding and the sympathy of the general reader, but, in the case of the present book at least, the interests of the students of the classics have not been neglected. In addition to the text proper, beautifully printed in small pica, with footnotes in smaller type which give the chief ancient sources, there is a copious appendix. In the first part of this (pp. 403-57), which is arranged to correspond with the sections of the text, the author presents briefly the chief problems which have arisen in connection with each writer, together with critical material bearing on them; in the second part (pp. 458-90), similarly arranged, there is a bibliography of fundamental editions and special studies.

Although the discussion of the material proceeds as in most other books of the kind, Rostagni very properly lays more emphasis than is generally done upon the literary, social, political, and economic background, against which each writer and his books are appraised—an emphasis which has led him to divide his matter into historical periods which take their name from movements, events, and personalities of the political world (cf. Appen., p. 407). Hence there are six parts with the headings: "The Preliterary Period," "Period of the Punic Wars," "Period of the Social Upheavals (from the Gracchi to Sulla)," "The Age of Caesar," and "The Age of Augustus." These parts are divided into chapters which have headings indicating the chief writer of a period or some especial feature characteristic of it (e.g., Part IV, chap. i: "The End of the Old Poetic Forms," with its subdivision, "The Political Crisis and the Development of Individualism"). Interesting is the author's discussion in this chapter (pp. 137-39; Appen., p. 421, where he combats the views of Bickel) of what he calls "the exhaustion" (*l'esaurimento*) both in politics and in literature which is characteristic of the period from 140 to the dictatorship of Sulla. In his explanation of the "crisis" no mention is made of the possible effect upon the population of the decimation of Italian youth through a cen-

tury of war, or of the decay of a free peasantry, or of the accumulation of wealth in the hands of a few; to Rostagni the causes were, in the political sphere, the failure of men to hold fast to the idea of the state, the more intimate contact with Hellenistic culture, the spread of Greek philosophic doctrines of the brotherhood of man, of equality, of democracy ("si propagano concetti di fratellenza umana, di eguaglianza, di democrazia" [p. 138]); and from these new political ideas came forth a new concept of literature as a means of securing the freedom of the individual as opposed to the state. One cannot help wondering whether ideologies of the present are not casting their shadows back over this interpretation of the past.

The same question arises as one reads the Introduction (pp. 4-18), a discussion of the "Characteristics and Values of Rome's Literature," and especially chapter ii: "The Preliterary Manifestations" (pp. 37-59). Here as part of his laudable defense of the independence and value of Italian culture, Rostagni emphasizes, just as Leo had done, the necessity of carrying back Greek influence on Latin to a period long before the third century B.C. and also the importance of recognizing the early fusion in the peninsula of Italic, Greek, and Etruscan elements. He protests vigorously (pp. 13 ff.; Appen., pp. 407-8) against the view that Hellenistic literature had a predominant influence upon the beginnings of Roman literature. There were, he admits (pp. 13, 174), "infiltrations of Alexandrianism," but infiltrations only, and he answers his own question (p. 13) why the first Roman poets turned from contemporary Greek models to Homer and the fifth-century dramatists by saying: "I contemporanei erano vuoti, imbelli e degeneri, non fatti per parlare all'anima di un popolo che ascendeva." The Greek influence which acted upon these early Romans is not to be considered a new factor, or as a sort of application from without, but rather as a complementary force (*azione*), progressive and normal, of artistic refinement and culture (p. 44). Owing to this, old and ruder forms, chiefly unwritten, developed through the years into satiric-comic forms ("dramatic satura, fabula Atellana, fabula palliata"), on the one hand, and, on the other, into tragedy and epic, which had their roots in the *carmina convivalia*, "epic and heroic lays." Thus Rostagni presents us with a new and expanded edition of Niebuhr's theory. There is something ironical in the fact that, in order to vindicate the independence of the Italian spirit, for the disparagement of which he makes the German Romantic school, in contrast to the Humanists, chiefly responsible, he has to adopt one of their most characteristic theories (cf. pp. 4, 335, 444). Here as elsewhere in the book, especially in the treatment of Vergil's early career, a chapter based upon the author's previous volume, *Vergilio minore* (Torino, 1935), Rostagni's views provoke dissent; but for this very reason the book is all the more stimulating. Moreover, since the author is on the whole careful to indicate, either in the footnotes or in the Appendix, the chief contradictory views, one has the means of checking his conclusions. It is, however, surprising that in his discussion of

the Appendix Vergiliana no mention is made of Rand's important article in *Harvard Studies*, Volume XXX (1919).

Misprints are few and unimportant; there is a good index, and the book is enriched with twenty-two photographs of epigraphical and paleographical material—of several paintings from Etruscan tombs, of the Tabula Iliaca, of the Cod. Ambros. of Terence, of the Tunis mosaic of Vergil, of fragments of the *Res gestae* of Augustus. It is unfortunate that, in order to secure individual volumes, one has to subscribe to the whole set at a cost of 1,500 lire.

University of Minnesota

MARBURY B. OGLE

Solon the Liberator: A Study of the Agrarian Problem in Attika in the Seventh Century. By W. J. WOODHOUSE. Oxford, New York, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1938. Pp. xviii+218. \$4.25.

This posthumous volume by the late Professor Woodhouse of the University of Sidney presents, with due emphasis on the agrarian situation, a stimulating and detailed—but not always convincing—study of the economic conditions in Attica before Solon and of Solon's economic reforms. The nature of the evidence is such that much of the work consists of bold reconstructions based on analogies and of arguments from probability. In the complicated development of the argument the author is even guilty of the inconsistency of supporting his own interpretation by means of a supposition which he has condemned as absurd when used to bolster up a rival theory. The result is that many who will agree in the general conclusion that the transformation of Attica from a land with "an agricultural population groaning in hopeless poverty" to one with a "numerous, prosperous and contented peasantry" was the work of Solon will disagree with the details of the reconstruction.

After having examined the chief sources (Solon, Aristotle, and Plutarch) and showed their lack of specific and accurate information, Woodhouse proceeds to his own reconstruction. This is built on two cornerstones: (1) the conclusion that the "Hektemors" retained one-sixth of the produce and surrendered five-sixths to the lord; and (2) the conviction that sale with option of redemption somehow entered into the process by which the land became enslaved. Since there is no evidence for this form of sale before the fourth century, the demonstration that it was used in the seventh depends on the hypothesis that it was invented to fit the situation created by the land tenure of the time when land was regarded as inalienable family property over which the individual enjoyed merely the right of usufruct. The proviso that the vendor and his heirs always retained the right to redeem the land made it possible to pretend that it had not been alienated. In order to accept this reconstruction, it is necessary to suppose further that, at the time of Solon's reforms, all "Horoï" recording such sales were destroyed so systematically

that not a single one has been found in all the extensive archeological investigations of Attica. Woodhouse is perfectly aware of this difficulty but, nevertheless, has faith in his reconstruction.

His conclusion concerning the Hektemors is based on no firmer foundation than his own feeling that the Greek word undoubtedly means "possessing or taking a sixth part" (p. 47), though all that it is safe to conclude from the word is some connection with a sixth part (cf. the definition of Liddell-Scott-Jones). The meaning "paying a sixth part"—ruled out as impossible by Woodhouse—was accepted by Plutarch and apparently also by Aristotle. To be sure, Woodhouse, though willing to accept "they were called Sixthers; for they cultivated the lands of the rich at the rent indicated" as a translation of the crucial passage in Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 2. 2), is unwilling to grant "that hereby Aristotle explicitly affirms that it was one-sixth of his crop that the Hektemor was under obligation to surrender to his lord by way of rent" (p. 48). Later, however, he remarks: "The rent of which Aristotle, without understanding the matter, is speaking, is the rent, being one-sixth of the annual produce, of the farm upon which an aforetime peasant holder, having been forced to part with his possessory right, now sits as life tenant" (p. 157). This recognition that at one stage a rent of one-sixth was paid combined with the conviction that Hektemors retained one-sixth and gave up five-sixths, seems largely responsible for his own complicated theory.

According to this theory, the first step in the creation of Hektemors was the sale of land with the option of redemption followed by the arrangement that the vendor was to till the land in return for the payment of one-sixth of the produce as rent. But these tenants were not Hektemors. The next step came when the tenant fell into arrears in his rent and "his arrears were funded as a loan, to be repaid at the next season's harvest, and this loan became immediately chargeable with interest at the rate of one-sixth" (pp. 157-58). When the tenant finally defaulted, he could "be haled into debt-slavery" or, at the option of the creditor, be made a Hektemor, a sort of serf receiving one-sixth of the produce of the land he tilled. To show how flimsy is the foundation of this elaborate superstructure it is enough to point out that when Woodhouse is refuting the theory that Hektemors were tenants he remarks: "How then, we repeat, for a Hektemor defined as 'tenant,' should arrears possibly arise, under a system of natural economy?" (p. 32)—an argument developed at some length. When he comes to the transformation of his own tenants into Hektemors, he remarks: "Nothing was less unlikely, than that the tenant should sooner or later find himself pushed for this rent" (p. 158). True enough, but arrears of rent were no more likely in the one case than in the other.

Technically, the book as a whole is in excellent shape, but there are a few errors: *Inscr. gr. ed. min.* (used repeatedly) is at best a curious reference for a specific volume of *IG*²; though the earliest epigraphical example of a Horos

has been placed about 350 B.C. (p. 97, n. 7), a speech of Isaeus is dated "about 364 B.C., fifty years earlier than the earliest dated epigraphical specimen of this type" (p. 108); on page 113 read Ditt. *Syll.*³, 685, 59, instead of 685, 33 (33 is the number of the appended note and not of the line); in the Bibliography, Hasebroek's *Trade and Politics in Ancient Greece* is assigned to Wade-Gery. A more serious fault is that, in spite of the impressive Bibliography, the detailed references to earlier works are inadequate. Thus, though it is clear that the author has given careful consideration to every phase of the problems considered and that the general interpretation is his own, it is impossible to tell, without reading the entire literature on the subject, how much of the work is new and how much is borrowed. Some of the faults noted probably would have been removed had the author lived to revise and see the book through the press.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

Mob Violence in the Late Roman Republic, 133-49 B.C. By JOHN WESLEY HEATON. ("Illinois Studies in the Social Sciences," Vol. XXIII, No. 4.) Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1939. Pp. 107. \$1.50.

This study has every appearance of a doctor's dissertation, which was completed in 1935. It opens with a chapter on "The Roman Proletariat," and then follow chapters on "The Rise of Mob Activities from the Gracchi to Saturninus," "Mob Violence and the Rise of Military Dictators: Saturninus to Sulla," "The Democracy and Catiline," "Clodius and His Contemporaries," and a "Conclusion." An appendix devotes six pages to "An Evaluation of the Main Sources"; there are five pages of Bibliography and an index.

The writer states that the Bibliography contains only such titles as were "accessible" to him in 1935. But this statement is surely a circumlocution for the titles he "consulted"; otherwise, the omission for this period of such a work as Drumann-Groebe is strange indeed, not to mention many other important studies. One is surprised that Heaton did not avail himself of the most recent translations of the sources. For example, a translation of 1875 is used for Velleius Paterculus; that of Sallust dates from 1879. E. Meyer, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Gracchen*, is cited as of Halle, 1894; the re-appearance of this most stimulating study, greatly enlarged and corrected in many places, in Meyer's *Kleine Schriften* is unknown.

Three things about this study surprised the reviewer as he began to get into it. He looked in vain for any attempt at the outset to state just what is "mob violence"; he was struck by the almost total lack of references to the work of modern scholars on the period; and closely connected with this disdain of recent scholarship was the lack of concern for the fundamental issues of the period. For example, E. Meyer, *Untersuchungen*, etc. (*Kleine Schriften*, p. 433, n. 1; only the first edition is available to me) writes: "Die ganze innere

Geschichte Roms in dieser Zeit [from Gaius Gracchus], bis zur Vernichtung der Ritter durch Sulla, besteht in dem Kampf des Senats und der Ritter um die Herrschaft"; but there are not more than a half-dozen references to the knights in Heaton's discussion of this period, and they are not considered important enough to find a place in the index.

But as the reviewer read further he could only conclude that these defects in the treatment of the period by Heaton were essential to his purpose, which was to smear the *plebs* and its leaders. This purpose could obviously be accomplished best by exerting no effort to understand or appreciate the political, social, and economic problems of the period—for, if these were understood, no man could avoid sympathizing with the efforts of the leaders of the *populares*, even when they opposed violence with violence; and if the sources, presenting as they do almost one hundred per cent the aristocratic and senatorial tradition, were used almost solely and no attention given to the work of modern scholars in getting behind this tradition at the real facts, every time Plutarch or Appian wrote that "passions were heated" and "anger seethed" among the commons, it could be presented as a clear case of "mob violence." Whereas, whenever a knot of senators, together with their clients and freedmen and slaves, took up arms and cudgels—well, they just did it. For instance, Heaton writes (pp. 49 f.): "The Tribune Gabinius, who had proposed to give Pompey supreme command against the pirates, was nearly slain in the senate house, being saved only through the intervention of a popular mob which made a rush at the senators and forced them to scatter." A few quotations from Heaton's treatment of the Gracchan period will serve to illustrate his approach to his subject.

An opening paragraph tells about the slave revolts over the Empire just before 133 B.C. Then "with the standard of revolt raised almost everywhere under the guise of social justice, the proletariat of Rome needed only a leader to arouse it to like efforts" (p. 21); Tiberius' plan is a "redistribution" (p. 22) of the state-owned land. (Thus the Gracchan reforms are tarred at the outset with duplicity and communism.) "The situation probably became so tense that the nobles lived in a state of terror which required some drastic remedy" (p. 23). A "mob" (one of the very few cases where the partisans of the senate are called such) led by Scipio Nasica does Tiberius to death. The trouble with Tiberius was that he was an idealist, not practical. Most of his activities "worked to the advantage of the Roman mob" (p. 25). (Apparently the Roman *plebs* is a "mob" at all times; and to try to get an idle proletariat back on small farms is bad.) Gaius is able to appeal to the people "in true demagogic fashion" (p. 25). Gaius should have "healed the wounds" opened during his brother's tribunate; his sponsoring of the claims of the Italians to full citizenship "meant a renewal of internecine strife"; he went ahead "adding fuel to the flame" (p. 26). (When things are wrong, nothing should be done about them for fear some people won't like it.) The "land and colonization schemes

of the Gracchi . . . failed to solve the social and economic difficulties affecting the masses" (p. 28). (Therefore they are to be condemned. But what legislation ever "solved" complicated social and economic ills? Last's sober discussion of the Gracchi [*Cambridge Ancient History*, IX, 89] calls Tiberius' plan for the partial redistribution of the public land "a scheme so sane in its conception and so successful in its results that it is futile to charge its author either with reckless vote-catching or with the Utopian aspirations of unpractical ignorance.") The Gracchi started the idea that "the government owed all citizens a living" (p. 33); Tiberius' program is an "attempted redistribution of wealth" (p. 89). Livius Drusus at a later time seeks to win over the masses "by the bait of the Gracchan laws" (p. 34).

Heaton's undisguised contempt for the commons of Rome and their leaders appears on nearly every page. When the tribunes wish to arouse the citizens against the scandalous bribery used by Jugurtha, they do so by "soap-box oratory" (p. 29). Sulpicius has about him "a large gang of knights"; but the army shows its "loyalty" by marching on Rome under Sulla (p. 37). The author paints the blackest picture of Sulpicius; if he had read a later edition of Meyer's essay on the Gracchi, he could have seen that the "key to the understanding of the tribuneship of Sulpicius" lies in the fact that the knights had lost the courts in 89 B.C. (*loc. cit.*).

The reader is promised in the Preface (p. 5) "an attempt to interpret the underlying causes and effects" of mob violence "in so far as our sources justify." This promise is feebly fulfilled. There is some portrayal of economic conditions in the first chapter; but the cause which lies closest to Heaton's heart and is mentioned again and again was the increase of citizens of alien stock (cf. pp. 13, 18, 20, 88-89); he speaks of the "semi-oriental proletariat" of Rome (p. 34). He is persuaded with Park that citizens of alien stock equaled, if they did not outnumber, citizens of free Roman stock (p. 88). Of the many causes which led to the breakdown of the republic the reviewer believes the admixture of alien blood to have been about the least important.

Students of the period will find nothing new in this dissertation; teachers will not recommend it to their classes, unless it be to point a moral.

C. H. OLDFATHER

University of Nebraska

The Lyric Genius of Catullus. By E. A. HAVELOCK. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1939. Pp. xii+198. 8s. 6d. net.

This interesting book does not readily lend itself to a review since the reviewer is faced with something of the same difficulty which faced the author in his attempt to communicate to others the essence of Catullus; "behind the words," to paraphrase his remark concerning Catullus (p. 3), "lurks the author's temper, a compound of wit and feeling." It is the "temper" of Mr.

Havelock which gives charm and no little importance to his book, and, to catch this, one has to read the book.

This represents the fruit of a teacher's attempt—and he must be a delightful teacher—to interpret Catullus to college students. The interpretation is by means of "imitations" rather than translations in English rhymed verse of twenty-six of Catullus' poems: thirteen from the first part of our manuscript collection, twelve of the epigrams, and the Epistle to Allius (68*b*). These poems are arranged in groups, "purely formally according to their mood" (p. 84), under the headings: "The Language of Lyric" (including 1, 27, 13; just why these three only are put here is not made clear), "The Language of Love" (11, 5, 7, 2, 3, 43, 86, 87, 92, 107), "Love and Death" (10, 96), "The Flower Cut Down" (68*b*, 109, 70, 8, 75, 72, 85, 76, 58, 11, 38). In each case the Latin text is printed on the left-hand page, together with brief remarks on the content and mood of the poem, the English imitation on the right.

Although Mr. Havelock rightly recognizes that the chief mark of Catullus' poetry is its expression of "purely spontaneous feeling unmixed with reflection and concentrated on personal things" (p. 93), although he finds fault with translations because "the translator, taxed to render meaning and construction, has no time to tune himself to the quick essential feeling which it was the poet's business to express" (p. 3), some of his "imitations" lack the very spontaneity he seeks to impart.

Part II of the book contains a group of essays under the general title, "Analysis of the Catullan Temper." In the first essay, "Canons of Catullan Criticism" (pp. 73-86), the author rightly rejects the idea, suggested by Frank and others, of "the two Catulluses" and maintains (p. 76) that Catullus "reveals himself scholar, wit, and sophisticate from first to last" (in another place, p. 104, he aptly compares him with Oscar Wilde). In protest also against current views he delivers a witty and devastating criticism against what he calls "the biographical method of criticism." The rest of the essays "seek to distil the essence of the poet's temper and to grasp the secret of his style" (p. 85). The author discusses Catullus' opinion of himself and its larger meaning in "Pessimus Poeta" (pp. 87-96); the social and literary ideals of the circle in which Catullus moved and wrote in "Homo Urbanus," "Homo Venus-tus," and "Doctus Catullus" (pp. 97-131); and concludes with two essays of a more general nature, "The Impermanence of Poetry" (pp. 145-60), in which he emphasizes the impossibility of communicating poetry through the medium of translation, and "Lyric and Liberty": I. "The Poetae Novi and Their Significance," II. "Catullus and Horace" (pp. 161-84). Here he attempts to explain, first, why, although the Roman Empire was an effective political instrument for many centuries, "poetry exhausted its vigor when Juvenal died" and, second, what the significance of the Alexandrian movement was in Roman literature, the representatives of which show in their poetry "a strong flavour of originality and emotional vigour and spontaneity" (p. 162). The

chief element in his explanation is his belief that Roman poets from the beginning, by giving up whatever lyric forms may have been traditional and adopting Greek quantitative measures foreign to their own expression and tradition, put themselves into a strait jacket which the *poetae novi*, because they adopted forms which though foreign were contemporary, alive, and close to their own expression, were able to burst. To Mr. Havelock, therefore, Horace, because of his adoption of the dead forms of Aeolic song, was the real villain in the tragedy of Rome's creative poetry. There is truth in this "reinterpretation of Roman literary history" (p. 162), but I wonder whether, in minimizing the effect of the loss of political liberty (p. 160), the author does not overlook the significant fact that untrammelled and spontaneous expression of personal emotion was possible for Catullus and his friends just because at this period there was, if not for the first time certainly for the last, not only political freedom but individual freedom as well. Perhaps Lucretius, Catullus, and Cicero were fortunate in dying when they did.

There are brief notes (pp. 184-93) to the essays in Part II and a satisfactory index. Every lover of Catullus and every lover of poetry will reap both pleasure and profit from Mr. Havelock's book.

MARBURY B. OGLE

University of Minnesota

Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian. By P. A. H. J. MERKX. ("Latinitas Christianorum primaeva," Fasc. IX.) Nijmegen: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1939. Pp. xvi+141. Dutch fl. 3.60.

The late J. Schrijnen, together with Christine Mohrmann, his successor as editor-in-chief of the series "Latinitas Christianorum primaeva," had already (Fascs. V and VI, 1936-37) given us an exemplary account of the syntax of Cyprian in the letters; we now have the same done, for the cases and tenses at least, in the *Tractates*—exemplary, I mean, as being all quite careful and proper; but this monograph of Merkx will hardly cause anyone's heart to miss a beat. Merkx tends in his grammatical lucubrations to a verbose style which I found tedious before I reached his final sentence on page 131. H. Janssen in Fascicle VIII (1938) had a more exciting subject (*Kultur und Sprache: Zur Geschichte der alten Kirche im Spiegel der Sprachentwicklung*), and it may be that Merkx suffers by comparison. The chase after African Latinity came to nothing long ago and never had any real quarry in matters of inflection and syntax (Stolz, *Hist. Gram.*, I [1894], 49; Leumann-Hofmann, *Lat. Gram.* [1926-28], p. 817), even though it was Cyprian himself who started that particular March hare (*Epist.* 25): "latinitas et regionibus mutatur et tempore." And in any case something more up to date than Watson's *Style and Language of Cyprian* (1896) or Bayard's *Le Latin de Saint Cyprien* (1902) was needed, and Merkx has deserved well of us all by adding his quota to help to fill the gap.

The use of adjectives like *caelestis*, *dominicus* instead of the genitive *caeli*,

domini is a characteristic feature of Christian Latin, as Schrijnen has shown. Merkx, who gives a useful list (pp. 24–28) of adjectives so used, in specifically Christian contexts, justly remarks that the frequency of their occurrence is considerably less in phrases where there is no Christian concept as such expressed or implied. And his examples serve to modify some of Löfstedt's dicta on the subject (*Synt.*, I, 94 ff.; *Per.* 77 f.), at least as far as concerns the usage of Cyprian. The perennial genitive of comparison, so-called—"Holy of Holies," "Song of Songs," and the like—inevitably comes up for discussion. It is more clearly recognized, however, than it used to be that something more than Semitic influence contributed to the construction in Christian Latin. In Greek tragedy (cf. Jebb on Soph. *OT* 465: ἀρρητ' ἀρρήτων) it was not Semitic but started from the genitive of the sphere, whole or partial (e.g., Hom. *Il.* xi. 248: ἀριδείκερος ἀνδρῶν; v. 38: δῖα θεῶν; *Od.* iii. 452: πρέσβα θυγατρῶν; cf. also Ennius *Ann.* 72: *sancta dearum*), as Riemann and Goelzer observed in 1897 (*Gram. comparée*, I, "Syntaxe," 123, n. 5, where they label the construction the "partitive genitive"). It is tempting to suspect a Semitic flavor about such an expression as *nummi nummorum* in Petronius, but the truth would seem to be that the Latin construction, possibly independent of Greek to begin with—for it occurs in other Indo-European languages as well as in Greek and Latin¹—was strongly reinforced by imitation of the Greek usage and then taken up anew by Christian Latin under the influence of the Hebrew which it translates literally. Merkx tells that in Cyprian the construction is entirely lacking except in biblical phraseology; elsewhere Cyprian eschewed the "genitive of comparison," even though the genitive with adjectives such as *eximius*, *praecipuus* was current usage.

Merkx accepts the term "inverted genitive," introduced by Schrijnen and Mohrmann, to describe an adnominal genitive of a noun (usually abstract), in which the noun plays the part of an adjective, i.e., there is an inversion of function. Neither the term nor the definition is altogether happy without further explanation; indeed, the definition would apply to some examples which Merkx classifies as genitive of content, e.g., *ira furoris*, "furious wrath."

But Merkx has covered his ground faithfully, following step by step through noun and verb the model arrangement and method set up by Schrijnen and Mohrmann in their two fascicles. Any adverse criticism which readers may be tempted to make will be limited to a very few such very minor matters as those noted here; for the rest, criticism will be wholly favorable, as it could not but be of a work that had the seal of Schrijnen's approval.

J. WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

¹ Cf. Oertel, *S. B. der bay. Akad. der Wissenschaften* (1937), Heft 3. But in Germanic (MHG) it appears to be due entirely to the influence of the Vulgate—according to Behaghel, *Deutsche Syntax*, I, 525. Oertel, however, cites not only a large number of Vedic examples but also O.N. *karl karla*. His objection (p. 39, n. 2) to ἀρρητ' ἀρρήτων is groundless; for, though plural, that is also neuter, which makes a difference. For Baltic examples see Brugmann, *Grundriss* (2d ed.), II, ii. 2 p. 599.

Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus, Part I: Le Codex 239 de Photius, Vol. I: Etude paléographique et critique; Vol. II: Texte, traduction, commentaire. By A. SEVERYNS. ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," Fascs. 78 and 79.) 2 vols. Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres; Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1938. Pp. xvi+404+3 plates; pp. 298. Fr. 200.

Proclus' *Chrestomathy of Literature* is known chiefly from two sources, the résumé in Photius' *Bibliotheca* 239 and the excerpts on Homer and the Epic Cycle in the Codex Venetus A of the *Iliad*. In his Preface Severyns says he had supposed it would be an easy philological task to combine these sources and reconstruct the original work, but after fifteen years of study only half the task is achieved in two sizable volumes. The reader must undergo a similar disillusionment. For if he is inclined a priori to think the extent of this publication somewhat excessive, a judicious perusal of the volumes themselves will surely convince him that little space has been wasted.

In the first volume, after an introduction in which the circumstances of the composition of Photius' *Bibliotheca* during a journey to Bagdad in 855/6 are interpreted realistically, Severyns tackles the manuscript tradition. Fortunately the field had been cleared by E. Martini, and Severyns has to deal with only two manuscripts instead of forty. The first part is devoted to a paleographical study of the two codices Marciani, establishing their age, history, secondary hands, and marginalia. The older manuscript (A, tenth century) has been extensively corrected, and it is necessary to recover its primary readings accurately. The other manuscript (M, twelfth century) presents no difficulties in this respect.

The next part is a critical comparison of the texts of A and M, in which every single variant is scrutinized separately. It is established beyond doubt that the text of M is the result of previous extensive and deliberate correction. By means of a virtual psychoanalysis, applied with an admirable balance of acumen and good sense, the character of this anonymous corrector is delineated for future identification.

The third part treats the indirect tradition found in sources that have excerpted Photius' résumé. The discussion is tinged with polemics against those who have derived the various excerpts directly from Proclus himself instead of Photius. The two earliest excerptors are the most important. The first is the scholiast on Plato in Parisinus 1807. Since this codex is of the ninth century, it brings the excerptor very near to Photius' own time. It must be noted, however, that Severyns' investigation of these scholia (I, 272-77) is not based on the most recent work on the manuscripts of Plato, and his conclusions are not in accord with its results.¹

The second excerptor of Photius' résumé is the well-known scholar Arethas, a pupil of Photius himself. Two extant codices, written about A.D. 915 by the

¹ L. A. Post, *The Vatican Plato and Its Relations* (Middletown, Conn., 1934); W. C. Greene, "The Platonic Scholia," *TAPA*, LXVIII (1937), 184-96.

scribe Baanes, contain excerpts from the *Bibliotheca* in Arethas' own hand in the margins. The excerpts agree constantly with M against A and thus lead to the identification of the anonymous corrector of the text of M with Arethas himself, a thesis worked out very thoroughly by Severyns in the last part of the first volume.

The second volume gives a critical text, translation, and commentary for Photius' *Bibliotheca* 239. The text, based on the elaborate studies in the first volume, is, though revolutionary, so well founded as to be almost impeccable. The commentary presents all the difficulties of interpretation raised by Photius' imperfect style, and solves most of them, with adequate reference to parallel tradition and critical literature. But it sometimes seems guilty of special pleading in defense of Proclus and Photius. Severyns especially opposes Kaibel's theory that Proclus' original work was a source for the scholia on Dionysius Thrax. But there is obviously a connection between Proclus and the scholiast that must be explained some way, even if the Proclus-Photius tradition is superior.

Severyns intends to complete his study of Proclus' *Chrestomathy* by an investigation of the tradition independent of Photius. The authorship and sources of the work will also be treated. We earnestly hope that nothing will prevent the full realization of this project in the same quantity and quality as it has been begun, for the standard of both thorough and sound scholarship exemplified in these volumes makes it a pleasure to have them at our disposal.

AUBREY DILLER

Indiana University

Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates. By GISELA SCHMITZ-KAHLMANN. (*Philologus*, Supplementband XXXI, Heft 4.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1939. Pp. xii+130. Rm. 8.

The author, in order to illustrate the purpose and importance of historical exempla in Isocrates, begins by analyzing the orator's treatment of certain strictly historical events. She then investigates his introduction of heroic personages and their supposed achievement into some of his political discourses. Finally—and this is the best part of the book—she discusses the significance of the ancestor theme in Greek literature generally and in Isocrates in particular. The net conclusion is that Isocrates placed a special value on the interpretation of earlier Greek history and historical exempla therein as a means of furthering his chief educational aim—the preparation for citizenship of the young men committed to his care. It is a painstaking compilation, but it contains little that is new and is not free from misconceptions and errors. Miss Schmitz-Kahlmann states that the *paradeigma* is not "Stilmittel" but "Denkform." This divorce between style and thought is of her creation; it were enough to say that the *paradeigma* is both. She also makes the erroneous assertion that the inner connection between the *paradeigma* in oratory and in the older Greek poets has not hitherto been observed. She would, moreover, have

shown a clearer grasp of historical continuity if she had been more familiar with Greek educational practice. After citing some *paradeigmata* from Greek poetry, she concludes that in the use of certain ethical concepts transmitted through exempla Isocrates' intellectual ancestors were not Gorgias and the Sophists but Tyrtaeus, Solon, and Theognis. What she should have pointed out is that Isocrates as a teacher built on the educational foundations laid at school. In Greece, as later in Rome, poetry—epic, gnomic, and even dramatic—was the chief subject taught to boys. Prose and the study of rhetoric came later. Speeches in the Homeric poems, *gnomai* from the elegists—these were things with which Isocrates' pupils were already familiar before they came to him. He himself in one passage (*Ad Nicoclem* 43) brackets Hesiod, Theognis, and Phocylides as guides for life. His younger contemporary, the comic poet Alexis (Frag. 135 [Kock]), gives us a list of school authors, in which Homer, Hesiod, and Orpheus are associated with writers of comedy and tragedy. That Miss Schmitz-Kahlmann does not seem too well acquainted with the modern literature of her subject is suggested not only by the sweeping contention noted above concerning the *paradeigma* in poetry and in oratory but by more specific instances. In a long footnote (p. 19) she discusses an obscure allusion in *Philippus* 42 and appears to imply that her solution of the crux is new. But the explanation that she gives is the one that has already been upheld by Krüger, Schneider, Mathieu, and myself! She rightly stresses Isocrates' acquaintance with Thucydides' *History*, quoting a recent article by Bodin in support; but she seems unaware that here, too, she is traversing old ground. Forty years ago von Scala analyzed a number of historical reminiscences in Isocrates which could be traced back to the orator's study of Thucydides, and remarkable similarities in the vocabulary of the two writers have also been pointed out long since. Lastly, it is a curious perversion of language to group Andocides, Aeschines, Isocrates, and the author of the *De vectigalibus* together and classify them as oligarchic. Nothing is more likely than that the last-named composed his pamphlet on the revenues of Athens in support of Eubulus' financial policy. Was Eubulus also an oligarch, and, in short, were Demosthenes and his supporters the only democrats at Athens? It is surprising that this monograph, which hardly rises above the level of an average doctoral dissertation, should have been published as a Beiheft of *Philologus*; for one had learned to expect more mature and original contributions in the series of supplements sponsored by that journal.

M. L. W. LAISTNER

Cornell University

Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors.

By STERLING DOW. (*Hesperia*, Suppl. I). Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1937. Pp. 258. \$3.00.

The present study is in the nature of a pioneer effort at utilizing the recently discovered Athenian inscriptions for the study of political institu-

tions by examining for a definite period all previously known and recently published inscriptions bearing on one specific institution. As such it is a distinct contribution and marks considerable progress, but even in this restricted field, as the author himself implies, further studies will be necessary. Not all prytany inscriptions are included. The study begins with 327/6 B.C.—the year in which decrees honoring the prytaneis began to be inscribed—and continues through the reign of Augustus adding one decree from the reign of Hadrian. Thus, all inscriptions bearing on the composition of the *boule* in the fifth and earlier part of the fourth century B.C. and the majority of lists later than the time of Augustus are omitted. The material included covers discoveries down to August, 1935, since when a number of prytany inscriptions have come to light.¹ Of the one hundred and twenty-one inscriptions discussed, a large number are published for the first time; others have appeared in *IG*² and *Hesperia* (cf. list on p. 258). When earlier publications are adequate, the text is not reproduced, but the documents are discussed and described and emendations frequently suggested.

It is scarcely necessary to say that Dow has worked meticulously to establish as correct texts as possible and to deduce all available prosopographical information. As a guide to this there is a special index of "Names of Men and Women" (pp. 217–49). A second index lists "Buildings, Deities, Demes, Festivals, Months, Tribes" (pp. 250–53); a third, "All Other Words" (pp. 253–58) but is exhaustive—except for the definite article—only for No. 64. In addition, he gives special attention to the form and evolution of the documents—which, in turn, helps to date individual inscriptions—and to the historical information to be deduced from them. Thus, he has established that the *aisittoi* of these documents are a group of minor officials that dined with the prytaneis at the Tholos and are distinct from the group that dined at the Prytaneion (pp. 22–24). He also has pointed out that the foreign relations of Athens are reflected in the decrees but probably goes too far when he suggests that the reference to *symmachoi*, who begin to appear after 200 B.C. in the list of those on whose behalf sacrifices are made, may mean "that Athens was formally an ally of Rome" (p. 9). If formal alliance is implied, it is more likely that the reference is to Rhodes and Pergamum, though even for these states no proof of formal alliance with Athens exists. As to Rome, it is now pretty well admitted that she had no treaty of alliance with Athens in 200 B.C., and the period of the Second Macedonian War and the ensuing reorganization of Greece is not one in which such treaties were freely made. The treaties with the Achaeans and Macedonians were exceptions due to special circumstances. Is it not possible that the Athenians included in their

¹ Nos. 15 and 22–26 (cf. also No. 5) of B. J. Meritt and W. K. Pritchett, "Greek Inscriptions" in *Hesperia*, IX (1940), 53–140 (Nos. 1–17 edited by Meritt, 18–26 by Pritchett). Nos. 24 and 25 for Hippothontis, with a distribution of seats between demes differing decidedly in the two documents and in turn with the distribution indicated in *Prytaneis* No. 64 of about the same period will be important—and cause difficulties—in any study of the representation of demes in the *boule*.

prayers as *symmachoi* those that had co-operated with them in war and might do so again, even though there were no formal treaties of alliance? It is tempting to suggest that the term is equivalent to *amici et socii* and that this formula appears in full in the expression used slightly later: *τῶν φίλων καὶ συμμάχων*. That this term was used in the early second century to describe states in a certain relationship to Rome is shown by its application, in the famous decree of Lampsacus, to the Massaliotes (*SIG*³, 591. 27), and the latter, certainly, must have been *amici* of Rome rather than allies with a hard and fast treaty of alliance. Furthermore, that *amicitia* as an institution was known to the Romans before the intervention in Greece is shown by the provision for friendship in the early treaties with Carthage (Pol. iii. 22. 4; 24. 3) and by the Roman relations with Hiero of Syracuse. Since these relations cannot be discussed at length here, it must suffice to say that Polybius (i. 16. 9) reports that after the treaty of peace was made the Romans treated the Syracusans as friends and allies. There was no treaty of alliance, but the relations of *amicitia* began with the treaty of peace, and thereafter the two states co-operated. Such co-operating friends were *φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι*, and the Athenian inscriptions suggest that the term was applied not only to the *amici* of Rome but also by the latter to the Romans and probably also to other states that were friendly to the Romans and to themselves.

"Allotment Machines" (pp. 198-215) is a separate study occasioned by the fact that two of the inscriptions studied were inscribed on *kleroteria*. It has since been amplified by the author through "Aristotle, the Kleroteria, and the Courts" (*Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, L [1939], 1-34). These two studies throw considerable light on the intricacies of Athenian procedure and, among other things, prove that the *kleroteria* of Aristotle (*Ath. Pol.* 63. 2) are allotment machines and not allotment rooms. This seems firmly established, though details in the reconstruction of the machines may be modified by later finds and though the machines studied are later and differ somewhat from those of Aristotle's time.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

Celsus, Kasussyntaxen hos A. Cornelius Celsus. Akademisk Avhandling av JOSEPH ENGLUND. Göteborg: Eranos' Förlag, 1935. Pp. viii+171.

This doctoral dissertation of Joseph Englund is a commendable piece of work which throws considerable light on the style and syntax of Celsus. His conclusions, though by no means startling to students of Celsus, present the evidence in a clear, convincing form. Some of the more significant findings may be summed up as follows:

1. Uses of genitive

Celsus, following Ovid, never combines two genitives as dissimilar modifiers of the same noun and rarely genitives mutually dependent.

The partitive genitive does not occur as often as in the classical period.

The possessive genitive is losing ground and is supplanted by a host of new adjective formations.

The objective genitive is very common and is used in a freer manner in accordance with the style of Livy and Ovid.

Quality is regularly expressed by the genitive, rarely by the ablative. Prepositional phrases with *ad*, *circa*, *cum*, and *ex* serve as substitutes.

2. Uses of dative

Verbs, both simple and compound, such as *haerere*, *accedere*, *accommodare*, which in classical Latin may be used with certain prepositional phrases, now commonly take the dative instead.

Prepositional phrases, especially with *super* and its derivatives, begin to take the place of dative with compounds and show the influence of vulgar Latin.

Celsus follows Ovid in employing an ablative construction with *proximus* and *proxime* to designate order and rank.

The dative with adjectives is far more extended than in classical Latin.

The pronominal adverb *huc* with adjectives, instead of the regular dative, is preferred by Celsus to designate a remedy against something bad.

The *dativus sympatheticus* is very common in phrases belonging to medical terminology and becomes generally more frequent.

The final dative is not only used with *esse* but with such verbs as *dare*, *destinare*, *patere*, *servare*, *valere*. Celsus, like Livy, also uses *ad* or *in* with the accusative to denote the end.

3. Uses of accusative

Some verbs compounded with *ante*, *ex*, *in*, *prae*—like *antecedere*, *evadere*, *excedere*, *invadere*, *praecedere*, *praevenire*—govern the accusative.

In accordance with the language of medicine many verbs, otherwise transitive, are used absolutely.

Celsus in the manner of Vitruvius, and occasionally of Cicero, regularly omits the accusative subject of the infinitive depending upon *cogere*. He extends this usage also to other verbs, such as *docere*, *iubere*, *pati*, and *sinere*.

Celsus gives a wider interpretation to accusative of the inner object, probably as a result of Greek influence.

Celsus seems to be alone in the use of *parvum* as an accusative of measure.

4. Uses of ablative

The ablative of separation has a bolder usage, both with simple and compound verbs, than in classical Latin.

The ablative of comparison is rarely employed, but *aequo*, *iusto*, and *solito* appear.

Like Ovid, Celsus uses *sponte* without a possessive attribute. After the manner of Livy the modal ablative is used in such medical expressions as *aequa portione*, *pari portione*, *paribus portionibus*. Celsus alone has *cum vi* in a modal sense.

Prepositional phrases with *a* or *ab*, *ex*, *in*, *per*, and *sub* are used to express the instrumental relations in addition to the regular ablative.

The ablative of cause has a much wider range of usage in Celsus than in classical prose.

The simple ablative with *laborare* is used to indicate the organ that suffers.

Causa with the prepositions *de*, *ex*, and *ob* is common. The prepositions *ex* and *ob* are always placed before the attributive modifier. In other causal relations *ex* and *ob* are also employed, as well as *per*, *propter*, and *sub*.

The ablative absolute with the present participle of *substare* shows Greek influence. The ablative absolute is freely used in a variety of constructions that appear in late and vulgar Latin.

Celsus, like Columella, uses the ablative, never the accusative in answer to the question "how long?"

Dr. Englund concludes that, on the whole, the language of Celsus corresponds to the prose of the classical masters but shows many variations from their usage traceable to Greek influence, to the vernacular, and to post-classical developments. He reveals strong poetical affinities also, especially with Ovid. Nor are certain novelties lacking, some limited to his particular style, others are imitated in subsequent writers.

If we correlate the details of this investigation with other studies and facts as they relate to Celsus, we may find further confirmation of our opinion that Celsus is the exponent of a powerful and elegant Latin style but that it is not the style of the classical period, rather that he followed closely upon Livy and Ovid and probably flourished between A.D. 20 and 50.

BRUNO MEINECKE

University of Michigan

Studien zur Ars poetica des Horaz. Von WOLF STEIDLE. Würzburg-Aumühle: Konrad Tritsch Verlag, 1939. Pp. 147. Rm. 4.50.

This Berlin dissertation, written under the direction of Stroux, is in the main an excellent piece of work. It pays tribute to Norden's paper of 1905, which has dominated recent study of the *Ars poetica*, but opposes the rigid scheme into which Norden and his followers forced the poem. Norden was right in recognizing the importance of the rhetorical background of the poem but wrong in trying to make a set rhetorical treatise out of it.¹ Steidle notes that Immisch (a follower of Norden) came to certain conclusions by using Jensen's work on Philodemus but that Jensen has since changed his mind. Steidle's commendable attitude is that there are a number of unsolved problems in the arrangement of the *Ars poetica* and that, since the use of Philodemus leads to difficulties in the study of our poem's composition, one may be skeptical about using any principle of composition drawn from sources outside the poem. In other words, Steidle proposes to study the poem itself,

¹ Cf. my remarks in *Class. Jour.*, XXXI (1936), 413.

to fashion a coat for it, rather than to force it into a garment made for a Greek rhetorician. The following is worth quoting, for it is a good guide in all our study of Latin literature (p. 7):

Erst dann, wenn Sinn und Aufbau des Horaztextes einigermaßen ausreichend erfasst sind, kann, wie es scheint, mit einiger Aussicht auf Erfolg die Frage aufgeworfen werden, welche Stellung der AP als Ganzes im Verhältnis zum Griechischen zukommt, ob und wie sie sich in den Rahmen der griechischen Poetiken einfügt und wie sie zu ihren Quellen, insbesondere zu Neoptolemos von Parion steht, dessen Wirken immer noch reichlich dunkel ist.

Most of the book is a detailed commentary on verses 1-294 of the poem. It is, in fact, an edition of these lines, without the text. Steidle lets Horace interpret the poem for us by citing passages from other poems, notably the *Satires*. In fact, he shows repeatedly how a thought or turn of phrase is characteristic of the *Satires*. The picture in verse 1, the interruption of the stooge (the current term for the fictitious interlocutor) in verse 9 are examples of the satiric style. When it comes to details, however, there are many points at which I would disagree with Steidle. The significance of his monograph lies in marking a new trend in our study of the poem.

B. L. ULLMAN

Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris. Edited, with Introduction and Commentary, by M. PLATNAUER. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1938. Pp. xix+186. \$2.25.

In promising a series which would reproduce Murray's Oxford text of Euripides and would accompany it with complete introductions and commentaries, the Oxford Press warmed the hearts of us all. With many of the annotated editions either obsolete or out of print, a modern commentary is much to be desired. After a study of this volume, the first of the series, I can say only that I am disappointed.

This disappointment is occasioned by the fact that the majority of the notes are devoted to picking over the flotsam and jetsam of emendation cast up on the shore of classical scholarship during the last four hundred years. Mr. Platnauer feels that this emphasis needs no apology. I differ. If "the usual habit of segregating critical notes merely results in the student's not reading them," their incorporation en masse in the exegetical material will certainly result in the student's avoiding the notes entirely. Furthermore, I should prefer my pupil to be lulled into a "dogmatic slumber in which he dreams of a text transmitted direct from heaven" rather than to secure the only too common impression that the sole purpose and worth of Greek tragedy is to serve as a gymnasium for editorial ingenuity. Certainly "criticism and interpretation must be complementary"; but for most of us criticism exists merely as an aid to interpretation, not as an end in itself. When Mr. Platnauer cites emendations which neither he nor Murray (nor, I may almost say, anyone else) accepts, he seems to be making an end of the means.

I am not attempting to discredit the editor's work. Mr. Platnauer has

stated the reasons for his procedure. He is entitled to his opinion. In some places, of course, the critical material is vital for interpretation. Doubtless many will find all his discussion helpful in special investigations. That his critical material has no value is not my contention; my thesis is that it does not belong in a member of this series.

That grammatical points are referred to Kühner-Gerth is satisfactory; for our undergraduates' sakes, however, we must continue to hope that British editors will begin to use Smyth. In the Introduction the treatment of the myth is adequate. Unfortunately, however, the references to Pausanias (several of which are slightly inexact) frequently will not bear the weight placed upon them. For example (p. x), Pausanias (ii. 22. 7) cannot be called the source of our knowledge that "the scene of the attempted sacrifice was Brauron, and Artemis was said to have saved her protégée by causing to be sacrificed in her stead not a deer but a bear." The editor owed the student at least Tzetzes (on Lycophron 183) and the appropriate passages of Apollodorus. In the discussion of the second version, the scholium on *Iliad* iii. 242 might have been included despite its doubtful value. The relatively few notes devoted to matters other than text and meter are frequently good; for example, the ghost of δῶε (note on l. 558) has long deserved laying. The samples which the editor gives us of his work in the general exegetical field make us wish he had devoted more effort and space to it.

Euripides wrote plays, and our only reasons for caring about them are their value as dramatic masterpieces and their position in the historical development of the drama and of general literature. Let the plays, then, be edited as plays. The almost recent interest in dramatic technique in the broadest sense of the term has certainly produced results which should be related to the individual plays. My sincere wish is that future editors in the series will not follow Mr. Platnauer's lead, despite the intrinsic value of his work.

University of Chicago

HAROLD B. DUNKEL

Excavations at Olynthus, Part VIII: The Hellenic House: A Study of the Houses Found at Olynthus with a Detailed Account of Those Excavated in 1931 and 1934. By DAVID M. ROBINSON and J. WALTER GRAHAM. ("Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology," No. 25.) Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1938. Pp. 370+111 pls. \$15.00.

This book consists of five parts. Part I ("Introduction") comprises three chapters and Part II ("Description of the Individual Houses"), ten. Part III ("The Houses: Plan and Rooms") comprises five chapters, of which one has fourteen subdivisions. Part IV ("The Houses: Construction") comprises nine chapters and Part V ("The Houses: Equipment"), seven. The plates include plans and photographs, both good and both, in many cases, carefully lettered to facilitate their interpretation. It will be evident that the presentation of the Olynthian houses is very complete. Houses at other sites are not professedly

treated, but comparative material is constantly discussed and the copious references will guide the reader to all writings of any importance on the Greek house. An important recent contribution is Robinson's article "Haus" written for the seventh supplementary volume of Pauly-Wissowa.

The authors note that the remarkable house at Dystos, usually assigned to the fifth century B.C., is not dated by any satisfactory evidence. It is, indeed, to be hoped that Dystos will receive attention when excavation becomes possible again. Dystos is a small site with little soil on it, yet it could hardly fail to yield evidence of high interest on the history of Greek dwellings.

As in all the volumes of the Olynthus series, which have made the discoveries at that important site available to scholars with unparalleled promptness, the extraordinary erudition and industry of Robinson are evident. This book is remarkable also for its clarity of style and arrangement and its consistency of plan. Its many subdivisions and its boldface type for paragraph headings give it somewhat the appearance of a textbook; and, in fact, it reaches textbook standards of usability, which is rarely true of scholarly works. Graham's careful study of houses at Delos and elsewhere is indicated by many valuable observations specifically credited to him.

This is an archeological publication of the first quality and the first importance.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

Greek Athletics and Festivals in the Fifth Century. By HESTER HARRINGTON Stow. ("Museum Extension Publications," No. 2.) Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1939. Pp. 29+40 plates. \$5.00.

This is the second publication in "a series of Illustrative Sets prepared to meet the need of teachers and students, designers, and laymen interested in cultures of the past." For this broad clientele illustrations have been chosen with more regard to their general interest than to their close connection with athletics and festivals. Eight of the plates picture the Parthenon and its sculptures, five others the sculptures of the temple of Zeus at Olympia. Plates 2 and 3, one a drawing and the other a photograph, show the same scene on the same vase. Among the less familiar objects are a model of Delphi, a model of Olympia, and a Damareteion in the Boston Museum. Considering the size (12"×16½") and the number of the plates, the price is low. It must be noted, however, that the plates vary in quality; in particular, several drawings reproduced from Furtwängler-Reichhold and Caskey-Beazley suffer perceptible deterioration.

The text, like the plates, takes in a great deal of territory and is distinctly intended for laymen. Flaws may be found in text and captions, but they are well written and should be satisfactory for their purpose. The typography is not commonplace; it is credited to Edna Leslie Freeman.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

Aus versunkenen Tagen: Jugenderinnerungen. By ENGELBERT DRERUP. ("Rhetorische Studien," *Ergänzungsband 2.*) Paderborn: Schöningh; Zürich: Götschmann, 1939. Pp. 299.

A philological journal is hardly the place for an extended review of a biographical sketch. But when that sketch deals with an eminent scholar, it certainly deserves at least passing notice even in a learned publication. Engelbert Drerup here describes the first thirty years of his life at home, at preparatory schools, and at several universities.

This book should appeal to various types of readers. Those who love the classics will find here many interesting sidelights on the great champions of their cause at the close of the old century and the beginning of the new. Foreign readers, who are not entirely familiar with the German school system, will find an excellent picture of the classical Gymnasium and the university, including the extra-curricular life of the students. The *littérateur* will find a real contribution to literature; Drerup is as fine a prose stylist as he is a poet. The general reader will find a valuable lesson in perseverance and fortitude: Drerup's life sometimes led over very rugged country, but to him every obstacle was merely a new challenge, a call to combat and fresh laurels.

The present reviewer hopes that a second volume will be forthcoming.

ALFRED P. DORJAHN

Northwestern University

AN ADDENDUM TO THE NOTE ON "ENGINEERING SUPERSTITIONS" (PP. 416-20), BY EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

While this note was in press, Dr. John P. Cooke, of the University of Chicago, kindly provided me with an equally interesting reference to the proposal to make a canal across the Isthmus of Panama.

There is a tale that when the plan for digging a canal at Panama was first mooted, Philip the Second of Spain was deterred from it by the argument, pressed by his clerical advisers, that if the Almighty had wished the seas to be joined, He would have joined them, just as, according to Herodotus, the people of Knidus were deterred by the Delphic oracle from cutting through the isthmus along which enemies could advance by land to attack them. If Zeus had wished the place to be an island, said the oracle, he would have made it one. But when an age arrived in which commercial and scientific views of nature prevailed against ecclesiastics, it became certain that here a canal would be some time or other made. Made it now has been. It is the greatest liberty Man has ever taken with Nature.¹

EUGENE S. McCARTNEY

¹ Cf. James Bryce, *South America: Observations and Impressions* (New York, 1912), p. 36.

BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Books submitted are not returnable.]

- ADCOCK, F. E. *The Roman Art of War under the Republic*. ("Martin Classical Lectures," Vol. VIII.) Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. 131. \$2.00.
- BATES, WILLIAM NICKERSON. *Sophocles: Poet and Dramatist*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940. Pp. xiii+291. \$3.50.
- BJÖRCK, GUDMUND. HN ΔΙΔΑΣΚΩΝ: *Die periphrastischen Konstruktionen im Griechischen*. ("Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistiska Vetenskaps-Samfundet i Uppsala," 32.) Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckerei-A.-B.; Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1940. Pp. 139. Kr. 6.
- CARROLL, SISTER M. BORROMEO. *The Clausulae in the Confessions of St. Augustine*. ("Catholic University of America Patristic Studies," Vol. LXII.) Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1940. Pp. xv+89. \$2.00.
- CERF, BENNETT A., and MORIARTY, HENRY C. (eds.). *The Bedside Book of Famous British Stories*. With an Introduction by BLISS PERRY. New York: Random House, 1940. Pp. xxii+1233. \$3.00.
- DEFERRARI, ROY J.; FANNING, SISTER MARIA WALBURG; and SULLIVAN, SISTER ANNE STANISLAUS. *A Concordance of Lucan*. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1940. Pp. vii+602. \$6.00.
- DELATTE, A. *Anecdota Atheniensia et alia*, Tome II: *Textes grecs relatifs à l'histoire des sciences*. ("Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège," Fasc. 88.) Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres; Paris: Librairie E. Droz, 1939. Pp. viii+504.
- DUCKWORTH, GEORGE E. (ed.). *T. Macci Plauti Epidicus: Edited with Critical Apparatus and Commentary in Which Is Included the Work of the Late Arthur L. Wheeler*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1940. Pp. xiv+464. \$7.50.
- GARITTE, GERARD. *Un Témoin important du texte de la vie de S. Antoine par S. Athanase: la version latine inédite des archives du chapitre de S. Pierre à Rome*. ("Études de philologie, d'archéologie et d'histoire anciennes: publiées par l'Institut Historique Belge de Rome," Vol. III.) Bruxelles: Palais des Académies; Rome: Accademia Belgica, 1939. Pp. 97.
- GILBERT, ALLAN H. *Literary Criticism: Plato to Dryden*. New York: American Book Co., 1940. Pp. xii+704. \$4.00.
- HAIGHT, ELIZABETH HAZELTON. *The Roman Use of Anecdotes in Cicero, Livy, and the Satirists*. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1940. Pp. ix+189. \$2.50.
- Hermathena*, No. LV (May, 1940). Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.

- LACOMBE, GEORGIUS. *Aristoteles Latinus*. Codices descripsit †GEORGIUS LACOMBE in societatem operis adsumptis A. BIRKENMAJER, M. DULONG, AET. FRANCESCHINI. Pars prior. ("Corpus philosophorum medii aevi academiarum consociatarum auspiciis et consilio editum.") Roma: Libreria dello stato, 1939. Pp. 763. L. 350.
- LANZANI, CAROLINA. *L'Oracolo delfico: saggio di religione politica nel mondo antico*. Genoa: Società editrice Dante Alighieri, 1940. Pp. viii+210. L. 35.
- LEJEUNE, MICHEL. *Observations sur la langue des actes d'affranchissement delphiques*. ("Collection linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris," Vol. XLVII.) Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1940. Pp. 161. 80 f.
- MACURDY, GRACE. *The Quality of Mercy: The Gentler Virtues in Greek Literature*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1940. Pp. xiii+185. \$2.00.
- MARELLA, M. *Ricerche e studi sulla scultura greca del sec. IV*. Roma: Stab. tip. Europa, 1939. Pp. 67+21 pls. L. 40.
- MARTIN, DONNIS, and MARTIN, GLADYS. *Latin Poetry of the Empire: Selections Edited with Commentary*. Chicago: Allyn & Bacon, 1940. Pp. xviii+417.
- MOORE, FRANK GARDNER (trans.). *Livy, with an English Translation in Thirteen Volumes*, Vol. VI: *Books xxiii-xxv*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1940. Pp. x+519+5 maps.
- MURRAY, GILBERT. *Aeschylus: The Creator of Tragedy*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Pp. xii+242. \$3.00.
- PÖSTGENS, PAUL. *Tibulls Ambarvalgedicht (II. 1)*. ("Kieler Arbeiten zur klassischen Philologie," Heft 6.) Würzburg-Aumühle: Konrad Triltsch Verlag, 1940. Pp. vi+91. Rm. 3.
- ROUSE, W. H. D.; ROSE, H. J.; and LIND, L. R. *Nonnos: Dionysiaca*. With an English translation by W. H. D. ROUSE, mythological introduction and notes by H. J. ROSE, and notes on text criticism by L. R. LIND. In 3 vols. Vol. I: *Books i-xv*; Vol. II: *Books xvi-xxv*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann, 1940. Pp. li+533; xi+547.
- RYBERG, INEZ SCOTT. *An Archaeological Record of Rome from the Seventh to the Second Century B.C.* ("Studies and Documents," Vol. XIII.) 2 parts. London: Christophers; Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1940. Pp. xiv+222; 223-47+54 pls. \$6.00.
- SCRAMUZZA, VINCENT M. *The Emperor Claudius*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1940. Pp. 328+1 map. \$3.75.
- SHERWIN, REIDER T. *The Viking and the Red Man: The Old Norse Origin of the Algonquin Language*. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1940. Pp. xxvi+340. \$2.50.
- STAM, J. (ed.). *Prudentius, Hamartigenia, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary*. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1940. Pp. 274. Fl. 5.25.
- THOMPSON, D'ARCY W. *Science and the Classics*. ("St. Andrews University Publications," No. 44.) New York: Oxford University Press, 1940. Pp. viii+264. \$1.00.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies, 1939*. Edited by the late S. G. OWEN. Bristol: J. W. Arrowsmith Ltd., 1939. Pp. x+96. 3s. 6d.

INDEX TO VOLUME XXXV

- Aeschylus, *Prometheus Bound*, analysis of **22**; vss. 332-34, discussed **182**
- Africa, oil tribute of **274**
- ἄλσος, meaning in Homer **188**
- annales*, of Pontifex Maximus, discussed **375**
- Aphrodite, in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* **387**
- archaisms, morphological, in Plautus **126**
- Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, Aphrodite and Athena in **387**
- Athena, in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata* **387**
- Augustine, references to witchcraft **294**
- Bithynia, Christians of, their ritual discussed **60**
- Book Reviews:
- Alfieri (ed. and trans.): *Gli atomisti: frammenti e testimonianze* (Hack) **337**
- Ax (ed.): *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia*, Fasc. 46: *De divinatione, De fato, Timaeus* (Pease) **92**
- Bassett: *The Poetry of Homer* (Post) **336**
- Becker: *Das Bild des Weges und verwandte Vorstellungen im frühgriechischen Denken* (Solmsen) **199**
- Bieber: *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater* (Flickinger) **69**
- Björck: *Der Fluch des Christen Sabinius, Papyrus Upsaliensis 8* (Walton) **207**
- Blake (ed.): *Charitonis Aphrodisiensis de Chaerea et Callirhoe amatoriarum narrationum libri octo* (Durham) **430**
- Bolten: *Die Imago clipeata: Ein Beitrag zur Portrait- und Typengeschichte* (Johnson) **237**
- Botsford and Robinson: *Hellenic History* (Grace) **222**
- Box (ed. and trans.): *Philonis Alexandrini in Flaccum* (Radin) **427**
- Buchmann: *Die Stellung des Menon in der Platonischen Philosophie* (Greene) **210**
- Clemen (ed. and trans.): *Lukians Schrift über die syrische Göttin* (Walton) **205**
- Codices Latini antiquiores: A Palaeographical Guide to Latin Manuscripts Prior to the Ninth Century*, Part III: *Italy: Ancona-Novara* (Ullman) **216**
- Collectanea Schrijnen: Verspreide Opstellen van Dr. Jos. Schrijnen* (Whatmough) **343**
- Colwell and Mantey: *A Hellenistic Greek Reader: Selections from the Koine of the New Testament Period, with Vocabulary and Notes* (Cadbury) **349**
- Crawford: *Greek and Latin* (Petersen) **230**
- Daux: *Delphes au II^e et au I^{er} siècle depuis l'abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la paix romaine 191-31 av. J.-C.* (Larsen) **97**
- : *Pausanias à Delphes* (Larsen) **97**
- Day: *The Origins of Latin Love-Elegy* (Prescott) **102**
- Deferrari, Barry, and McGuire: *A Concordance of Ovid* (Bruère) **79**
- Delatte: *Herbarius: recherches sur le cérémonial usité chez les anciens pour la cueillette des simples et des plantes magiques* (2d ed.) (McCartney) **218**
- De Marco: *De scholiis in Sophoclis tragoedias veteribus* (Dunkel) **99**

Book Reviews—continued

Dow: *Prytaneis: A Study of the Inscriptions Honoring the Athenian Councillors* (Larsen) **446**

Drerup: *Aus versunkenen Tagen: Jugenderinnerungen* (Dorjahn) **454**

von Duhn: *Italische Gräberkunde, Zweiter Teil* (Van Buren) **321**

Englund: *Celsus, Kasussyntaxen hos A. Cornelius Celsus* (Meinecke) **448**

Erikson (ed.): *Sancti Epiphani episcopi interpretatio euangeliorum* (Whatmough) **318**

—: *Sprachliche Bemerkungen zu Epiphanius' Interpretatio euangeliorum* (Whatmough) **318**

Fox: *The Life and Times of St. Basil the Great as Revealed in His Work* (Shepherd) **350**

Franceschini: *Il Commento di Nicola Trevet al Tieste di Seneca* (Barlow) **341**

—: *Studi e note di filologia latina medievale* (Barlow) **341**

Gabathuler: *Hellenistische Epigramme auf Dichter* (Helmbold) **101**

Gillespie: *Vergil, Aratus and Others: The Weather-Sign as a Literary Subject* (Allen) **235**

Gray: *Foundations of Language* (Emeneau) **311**

Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XLIX (Swain) **234**

Havelock: *The Lyric Genius of Catullus* (Ogle) **440**

Heaton: *Mob Violence in the Late Roman Republic, 133-49 B.C.* (Oldfather) **438**

Heichelheim: *Wirtschaftsgeschichte des Altertums* (Blake) **73**

Higham and Bowra (eds.): *The Oxford Book of Greek Verse in Translation* (Dunkel) **229**

Housman (ed.): *M. Manilii Astronomicon I-V* (editio altera) (Boyer) **223**

Jaeger: *Demosthenes: The Origin and Growth of His Policy* (Smith) **77**

Kent (ed. and trans): *Varro on the Latin Language: With an English Translation*, Vol. II: *Books VIII-X, and the Fragments* (Whatmough) **82**

Koerte (ed.): *Menandri quae supersunt*, Vol. I: *Reliquiae in papyris et membranis vetustissimis servatae*, (3d ed.) (Post) **339**

Koster (ed.): *Plutarchi Vitam Arati edidit, prolegomenis commentarioque instruxit A. J. Koster* (Larsen) **90**

Kuiper: *Attische Familiekomedies vom omstreeks 300 v. Chr. I. Het originel van Plautus' Epidicus* (Duckworth) **86**

—: *Diphilus' Doel en Deel in de Rudens van Plautus* (Duckworth) **201**

—: *Two Comedies by Apollodorus of Carystus. Terence's Hecyra and Phormio* (Duckworth) **201**

Lämmli: *Das attische Prozessverfahren in seiner Wirkung auf die Gerichtsrede* (Dorjahn) **236**

Lameere: *La Tradition manuscrite de la correspondance de Grégoire de Chypre patriarche de Constantinople (1283-1289)* (Costas) **232**

Livingstone: *Portrait of Socrates* (Dunkel) **108**

McDermott: *The Ape in Antiquity* (Johnson) **344**

Marg: *Der Charakter in der Sprache der frühgriechischen Dichtung* (Seimonides, Homer, Pindar) (Post) **234**

Marmorale: *Giovenale* (Ullman) **214**

Meritt and West: *The Athenian Assessment of 425 B.C.* (Smith) **105**

Merkx: *Zur Syntax der Kasus und Tempora in den Traktaten des hl. Cyprian* (Whatmough) **442**

Monumenta Asiae Minoris antiqua, Vol. V: *Monuments from Dorylaeum and Nacolea* (Larsen) **107**

Mountford: *Bradley's Arnold Latin Prose Composition* (Westington) **348**

- Nixon (trans.): *Plautus: With an English Translation*, Vol. V (Prescott) **342**
- Oates and O'Neill, Jr. (eds.): *The Complete Greek Drama: All the Extant Tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides, and the Comedies of Aristophanes and Menander, in a Variety of Translations* (Greene) **220**
- Olzsha: *Interpretation der Agramer Mumienbinde* (Bonfante) **323**
- Papyri Osloenses, Fasc. III (Schuman) **212**
- Platnauer (ed.): *Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris* (Dunkel) **451**
- Porter: *Plutarch's Life of Aratus with Introduction, Notes, and Appendix* (Larsen) **90**
- Powell: *The History of Herodotus* (Lattimore) **331**
- Przychocki: *De Menandri comici codice in patriarchali bibliotheca Constantinopolitana olim asservato* (Post) **109**
- Rini: *Petronius in Italy, from the Thirteenth Century to the Present Time* (Ullman) **103**
- Robinson and Clement: *The Chalcidic Mint and the Excavation Coins Found in 1928-1934* (Noe) **209**
- : and Graham: *Excavations at Olynthus, Part VIII: The Hellenic House* (Johnson) **452**
- Rostagni: *La Letteratura de Roma repubblicana ed Augustea* (Ogle) **434**
- Roussel: *Sparte* (Robinson) **109**
- Salanitro: *Tibullo* (Ullman) **104**
- Scharf: *Studien zur Bevölkerungsgeschichte der Rheinlande auf epigraphischer Grundlage* (Herrling) **233**
- Schlesinger: *The Greek Aulos: A Study of Its Mechanism and of Its Relation to the Modal System of Ancient Greek Music, Followed by a Survey of the Greek Harmoniai in Survival or Rebirth in Folk-Music* (Kidd) **329**
- Schmitz-Kahlmann: *Das Beispiel der Geschichte im politischen Denken des Isokrates* (Laistner) **445**
- Schnabel: *Text und Karten des Ptolemäus* (Diller) **333**
- Severyns: *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus, Part I: Le Codex 239 de Photius* (Diller) **444**
- Shorey: *Platonism Ancient and Modern* (Hack) **315**
- Shotwell: *The History of History, Vol. I* (Laistner) **195**
- Smith and Moorhead: *A Short History of the Ancient World* (Bone) **236**
- Snell: *Euripides Alexandros und andere strassburger Papyri mit Fragmenten griechischer Dichter* (Dunkel) **345**
- Steidle: *Studien zur Ars poetica des Horaz* (Ullman) **450**
- Stoessl: *Die Trilogie des Aischylos: Formgesetze und Wege der Rekonstruktion* (Post) **98**
- Stow: *Greek Athletics and Festivals in the Fifth Century* (Johnson) **453**
- Svensson: *Der Gebrauch des bestimmten Artikels in der nachklassischen griechischen Epik* (Lind) **106**
- Tarn: *Greeks in Bactria and India* (Bohrnsky) **198**
- Thomson (ed.): *The Oresteia of Aeschylus, Edited with Introduction, Translation, and a Commentary in Which Is Included the Work of the Late Walter G. Headlam* (Regenbogen) **305**
- Visser: *Götter und Kulte im Ptolemäischen Alexandrien* (Brady) **94**
- Völker: *Fortschritt und Vollendung bei Philo von Alexandrien: Eine Studie zur Geschichte der Frömmigkeit* (Goodenough) **225**
- Walde and Hofmann: *Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, Part XI* (Whatmough) **95**
- Warmington (ed. and trans.): *Remains of Old Latin, Vol. III: Lucilius, The Twelve Tables* (Ullman) **217**

Book Reviews—continued

- Wiegand (ed. and trans.): *The Non-dramatic Works of Hrosvitha: Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Gamer) **226**
- Wifstrand (ed.): *Aus der Papyrus-sammlung der Universitätsbibliothek in Lund*, Vols. I and II (Schuman) **349**
- Winspear and Silverberg: *Who Was Socrates?* (Sabine) **347**
- Winter (ed.): *Papyri in the University of Michigan Collection: Miscellaneous Papyri* (Hardy) **227**
- Woodhouse: *Solon the Liberator: A Study of the Agrarian Problem in Attika in the Seventh Century* (Larsen) **436**
- Youtie, Schuman, and Pearl (eds.): *Tax Rolls from Karanis, Part I: Text* (Hardy) **227**
- books received **110, 238, 351, 455**
- Caesar, *B.G.* vii. 22. 5 ("apertos cuniculos"), discussed **190**; text history of the *Corpus Caesarianum* **113**
- Christians, Bithynian, ritual of **60**
- Cicero, *De rep.*, new fragments of **423**; Platonic influence on **143**. See also "S.V.B.E."
- Delphi, sacred doves of **49**
- Diocletian, accession of **302**
- Drusus, portraits of, discussed **64**
- Egypt, gods, their relation to Greek gods **300**
- engineering, superstitions **416**
- Epicurus, his three-wheeled chair **183**
- Erasmus, translation of Lucian's *Longaevi* **397**
- Festus, a new gloss **192**
- Germanicus, portraits of, discussed **64**
- Greece, gods, relation to Egyptian gods **300**
- Herodotus, i. 174, parallels **416**; ii. 50, and 52, discussed **300**
- historiography, ancient, theory of the "Four Monarchies" in **1**; Latin, in the fifth century **241**. See also "anales"
- Homer, *Iliad* ix. 336, discussed **188**
- Horace, proper names in **420**
- Isaeus, *Index verborum* **68**
- Ithaca, Homeric cave on **52**
- Livy, his *Patavinitas* **56**
- Lucian, *Longaevi*, Erasmus' translation of **397**
- magic. See witchcraft
- Mantua me genuit*, as a literary motif **180**
- Ninnius **420**
- Numerian, death of **302**
- Odysseus, his choice in Plato, *Rep.* 620 C-D **67**
- Onysius **420**
- Plato, *Cratylus* 398 c-e, discussed **424**; *Philebus*, discussed **154**; *Rep.* 620 C-D, discussed **67**; influence on Cicero **143**. See also Porphyry
- Plautus, archaisms in **126**; delayed exits in **39**
- Pliny the Younger, *Ep.* x. 96 **60**
- Pontifex Maximus, the annals of the **375**
- Porphyry, life of Plato **284**
- Propertius, i. 22, discussed **297** and **426**
- Raetic, discussion of **186**
- Roman Empire, opposition history under **1**
- Sardis, name of **54**
- Seneca, *Ep. mor.* 15. 8 (*in id latus*) discussed **185**
- Socrates, his *Daimonion* **425**
- superstitions, concerning engineering **416**
- S.V.B.E., Cicero's use of **304**
- Tacitus, *Ann.* ii. 83 **64**
- τρικύλιστος, meaning of **183**
- trireme, oarage of **353**
- Valerius Flaccus, *Argonautica*, introduction, discussed **259**
- Vergil, epitaph, influence of **180**
- Vinius **420**
- warships. See trireme
- witchcraft, Augustine's references to **294**

